

THE CHURCHMAN

JULY -
SEPTEMBER 1960

Contents

Vol. LXXIV. No. 3
New Series

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	147
THE SPIRITUAL ISSUES OF THE REFORMATION	
Graham Windsor, B.A., B.D.	152
ANGLICAN EVANGELICAL VIEWS OF THE BIBLE, 1800-1850	
Arthur Pollard, B.A., B.Litt.	166
CHRISTIANITY AND THE PROBLEM OF ORIGINS	
The Editor	175
BOOK REVIEWS	
Aileen Guilding : <i>The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship</i>	198
Peter Hammond : <i>Liturgy and Architecture</i>	200
Gordon Donaldson : <i>The Scottish Reformation</i>	202
Adam Fox : <i>Dean Inge</i>	203
Olive J. Brose : <i>Church and Parliament</i>	204
T. A. Roberts : <i>History and Christian Apologetic</i>	205
Frank West : <i>The Country Parish Today and Tomorrow</i>	206
Donald McGavran : <i>How Churches Grow</i>	207
Reinhold Niebuhr : <i>Nations and Empires</i>	208
W. C. Van Unnik : <i>Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings</i> ...	209
Kendrick Grobel : <i>The Gospel of Truth</i>	211
H. Maurice Relton : <i>Studies in Christian Doctrine</i>	211
Clinton D. Morrison : <i>The Powers that Be</i>	213
Neville Clark : <i>Call to Worship</i>	214
A. M. Hunter : <i>Interpreting the Parables</i>	215
W. R. F. Browning : <i>The Gospel according to St. Luke</i> ...	216
Bo Giertz : <i>With My Own Eyes</i>	216
Basil F. C. Atkinson : <i>The Book of Exodus</i>	217
D. S. Russell : <i>Between the Testaments</i>	218
Paul Auvray, Pierre Poulain, Albert Blaise : <i>The Sacred Languages</i>	219
R. H. Fuller and R. C. P. Hanson : <i>The Church of Rome</i>	219
Roger Lloyd : <i>The Borderland</i>	220
Robert Ernest Hume : <i>The World's Living Religions</i> ...	221
Martin Buber : <i>I and Thou</i>	222
Charles Gulston : <i>No Greater Heritage</i>	222
Ed. Whit Burnett : <i>The Human Spirit</i>	223
Norman Vincent Peale : <i>The Amazing Results of Positive Thinking</i>	223
Ed. Reginald Woods : <i>Harvest of the Years</i>	224
Kenneth C. Barnes : <i>The Creative Imagination</i>	224

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :

THE REV. PHILIP E. HUGHES, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed.

Books for review, manuscripts, and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : Two Shillings and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings per annum, post free.

In the U.S.A., annual subscription one dollar, payable to The Seminary Bookstore, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., U.S.A.

Publishers :

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

Writers in this Issue

ARTHUR POLLARD is Lecturer in English Language and Literature in the University of Manchester.

GRAHAM WINDSOR is at present an ordinand in training at Clifton Theological College. His article gives the text, somewhat abbreviated, of his essay which was awarded the Johnston Prize last year, competed for under the auspices of the Reformation Church Trust.

Editorial

"I AM, and profess myself to be, a member of the Church of England. . . . I keep close to the Articles and Homilies, which, if my opposers did, we should not have so many dissenters from her. But it is most notorious, that for the iniquity of the priests the land mourns. We have *preached* and *lived* many sincere persons out of our communion. I have now conversed with several of the best of all denominations; many of them solemnly protest that they went from the Church, because they could not find food for their souls. They stayed among us till they were starved out." So wrote George Whitefield in his Journal of 1739 when he was twenty-four years old. Even at this early age Whitefield who was never other than a loyal and punctilious member of the Church of England, was the remarkable evangelist and expounder of God's Word that he was to remain till the end of his life. Undoubtedly the greatest preacher our Church has ever had, and very probably the greatest preacher since the Apostolic Age, this young clergyman, indefatigable in the zeal and single-mindedness of his evangelical labours both in the homeland and in the new territories across the Atlantic, already knew what it was to meet with fierce opposition, not least from dignitaries and fellow-ministers of the Church of England, from whom he might more reasonably have expected support and co-operation because of the divine blessing and power which so indisputably attended his ministry. How different the present situation in our land might have been had not our ecclesiastical forefathers persecuted George Whitefield and others of the prophets sent by God; how much stronger the spiritual force of our Church had not multitudes of earnest Christians been in the past driven into dissent and non-conformity by the prejudice and unfaithfulness of men who had been appointed, not to scatter, but to shepherd the flock of Christ in the way of the everlasting Gospel. But instead today we see that flock disunited and rent asunder. The guilt of schism does not always lie at the door of those who separate. "I love all who love the Lord Jesus," declared Whitefield that same year; and that is the manifesto of true ecumenicity.

George Whitefield was a man raised up by God for his day. He was never made a bishop, but if ever there was a man in the true apostolic succession it was he. This must at once be evident to all who read his *Journals*, a new edition of which, admirably produced by the Banner of Truth Trust and edited by Mr. Iain Murray, has just been published. This fine volume of nearly 600 pages, with eight illustrations and a map, is priced at the astonishingly low figure of 15s, and should be procured and read by all who have a concern for pure and undefiled religion. The *Journals* cover only the first twenty-six years of Whitefield's life, but what a picture they present of the wonderful things that God is able to do through the life of a single man—and what is more a very young man—who is fully dedicated to the cause of Jesus Christ. The *Journals* are autobiographical, but they are unmarred by any note of self-esteem or egocentricity. The temptation to pride was of course felt: "Had it not been for my

compassionate High Priest, popularity would have destroyed me", we find him writing in 1737. "I used to plead with Him, to take me by the hand and lead me unhurt through this fiery furnace. He heard my request, and gave me to see the vanity of all commendations but His own." Few men, indeed perhaps no others since the first century, have been permitted to see so phenomenal a response to their preaching; yet these pages present, in a completely unaffected manner, a portrait of a man who was filled with the grace, power, joy, humility, and maturity of the Holy Spirit. They do not possess, nor do they pretend to, literary distinction, but are simply a plain record of God's dealings with and through one man who presented himself as a living sacrifice for the sake of his Master and Saviour.

It is indeed an amazing story. Whitefield was like a magnet who attracted people in vast numbers to hear the Gospel and bound them to Christ, and inevitably to himself also, in the bonds of deepest love. Attentive throngs of 20,000 and more were not unusual. Picture him preaching on June 1st, 1739, "at a place called Mayfair, near Hyde Park Corner," to a congregation of nearly eighty thousand (the whole population of London in his day was not ten times that number). He was not physically robust, nor did he enjoy the mechanical aid of microphones and amplifiers, let alone radio and television, which we take so much for granted to-day when we talk of mass communication. Such natural abilities as he had were improved to the glory of God, who enabled him to lift up his voice like a trumpet so that all might hear the Good News. With untiring application he proclaimed the Word wherever people could be found to listen—in cathedrals, in parish churches, in private houses, in taverns, in the streets, and in the open fields, to the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, to soldiers, seamen, colliers, emigrants, and prisoners, at all times of the day and night, and every day of every week. He journeyed incessantly. He visited the sick, counselled the troubled, reproved the careless, and rejoiced with all who were lovers of Christ. Careless of himself, he collected constantly for the relief of the poverty-stricken, for the erection of his beloved Orphan House in New England, and for the provision of schools for under-privileged children.

The *Journals* speak to the heart of the reader, challenging all who profess the name of Christ to be more faithful and more energetic and more prayerful and joyful in letting their light shine before men. Would that Almighty God would raise up such an apostolic man as George Whitefield in the Church of England today, so that once more we might see men, women, and children in their multitudes drawn by the Holy Spirit's power to hear and respond to the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ!

* * * *

At last month's meeting in the University of St. Andrews of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches the Archbishop of York wisely warned against the concept of unity as an end in itself and emphasized the importance of recognizing that genuine Christian unity must be unity in truth and in sanctity. The following paragraph, which occurs in the Commission's Report to the

Central Committee on the subject of the Future of Faith and Order, is significant and will be welcomed by Evangelicals :

The Commission on Faith and Order understands that the unity which is both God's will and His gift to His Church is one which brings all in each place who confess Jesus Christ as Lord into a fully committed fellowship with one another through one baptism into Him, holding the one apostolic faith, preaching the one Gospel, and breaking the one bread, and having a corporate life reaching out in witness and service to all, and which at the same time unites them with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are acknowledged by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls the Church.

The Report goes on to add that "in particular we would state emphatically that the unity we seek is not one of uniformity"—a statement which will be reassuring to those who have had fears that a great monolithic world Church was the goal which filled the horizon of the WCC theologians.

Also welcome is the decision to recommend for adoption at next year's assembly to be held in New Delhi an expanded form of the present basis of membership, which will include explicit reference both to the Scriptures and to the Holy Trinity, as follows : "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." This represents a very distinct improvement in that it is a declaration which is, by comparison with the present basis, more properly and adequately *Christian*.

While on the subject of ecumenicity we are pleased to call attention to Volume II of *Conflict and Agreement in the Church* by Professor T. F. Torrance of the University of Edinburgh, which has recently been published by the Lutterworth Press (213 pp., 35s.), and which is devoted to the theme of *The Ministry and the Sacraments of the Gospel*. Like the earlier volume, on *Order and Disorder*, this book is a collection of articles and essays which have previously appeared in various periodicals and symposia. The earnest ecumenical concern of Dr. Torrance, who is a member of the Faith and Order Commission, shines strongly through these pages. "How can Churches sit down separately at the Lord's Table to proclaim the death of Christ till He come," he asks in the Introduction, "when by their very separation they are acting a lie to reconciliation through the Blood of Christ?" "So soon", he says (p. 193), "as we realize that the Eucharist is charged with the real presence of the Son of Man, to whom all judgment has been committed, we realize that it is the Lord's Supper (*Kyriakon deipnon*) and not our own (*idion deipnon*) and that we cannot send any Church or any sincere baptized believer away, without sinning against the majesty and Grace of the Son of Man. That does not mean that the Church is prohibited from 'fencing the Table', by excluding from participation in the Eucharist the lapsed who have denied their Baptism or the impenitent and insincere, but it does mean that the Church must exercise its discipline *with the authority of the*

Son of Man, and not with the authority of priests and scribes and Pharisees. It is by the Word that the Son of Man exercises His authority, and by the Word that He judges and divides between men. . . . In other words, the real fencing of the Holy Table is lodged in the prophetic ministry through which the holy Majesty and Grace of the Son of Man are brought to bear upon the Church. It is when the Son of Man, Christ crucified and Christ to come, is proclaimed with power in all His saving grace and judgment, that the Table is kept holy and undefiled; and it is then when His Word and authority are glorified that it is indeed the Lord's Table and the Lord's Supper, and not a private supper owned and administered on exclusive principles by the Church." Not everyone will find Professor Torrance's style of theologizing at all times to their liking, but these are good words which deserve not only to be pondered but also to be acted upon.

* * * *

The Preface to the *Crockford Clerical Directory*, of which the 1959-60 issue was published in July (Oxford University Press, 9 guineas), has become quite an Anglican institution. It is expected to be critically incisive, outspoken, and spicy. As, however, its author's identity is conventionally concealed under the cloak of anonymity, the Preface hardly carries the weight which it might otherwise do—despite the assurance given by the publishers that the author of the Preface is "a person of distinction in the Church of England". Free criticism from within is by no means to be deprecated and can have beneficial effects. In the current issue the Preface-writer has a good deal that is critical to say about bishops. He views with disfavour, for instance, the custom of translating diocesans from one see to another. "The movement of bishops from see to see became common," he observes, "at a time when the incomes of the various sees differed widely, and it was possible to arrange a *cursus stipendiorum* which began with one of the Welsh sees or the see of Hereford, and worked upwards to plums such as Ely and Winchester." Now, however, that this disparity between episcopal incomes is much less marked, questions of prestige and "promotion" may have much to do with such shufflings of the episcopal pack. Dioceses which are comparatively small or of modern creation tend to be regarded as less important than those which are large or ancient. This conception is condemned as "objectionable". "The newer dioceses have generally come into being because there have grown up big new areas of population. In them the Church has the task of establishing itself as an integral part of the community, traditions have to be formed, local patriotism developed. None of this is likely to happen if the diocese is used as a rung on the ladder of promotion. There is need, in these dioceses above all, for bishops who will stay and devote the rest of their life's work to the development of the Church in the urban areas."

The author also focuses his monocle on suffragan bishops, rightly (in our opinion) remarking on "the anomalous character of suffragan bishops, who exist only because the Church lacks the courage to break with feudal ideas and divide its dioceses on a rational basis", and

charging that "the modern creation of suffragan bishoprics has quite outrun theological sense", and that "it is a degradation of the episcopal office that we should now have a class of episcopal curates some of whom expect in due course to become episcopal incumbents". We have long felt that of all the dignitaries of the Church the suffragan bishops are the least to be envied. Apart from their title, they have no satisfactory status, and we cannot but agree with the comment that "if there is a bishop's work to be done for which no bishop has the time, then there is a case for the creation of a new diocese rather than for the appointment of an episcopal curate who will hope to move on one day to a charge of his own".

In fulfilment of a decision of the 1958 Lambeth Conference, a new wonder has been seen in the Anglican world in the creation of an entirely novel office to which, presumably, it is intended that a man in episcopal orders should always be appointed. This is the post of Executive Officer of the Anglican Communion, for which an American bishop, the Right Reverend Stephen Bayne (a man of admirable personality), has been taken away from his diocese and brought to London. The Preface-writer expresses the hope that "he will not attempt to introduce into Anglican affairs those aspects of American organization which have been so much criticized in the affairs of the World Council of Churches", and adds that "it is perhaps important that Dr. Fisher's successor at Lambeth should be a man whose sympathies do not lie in that direction". To this we would add our own apprehension lest (with all due appreciation of our good friends from across the Atlantic) future Lambeth Conferences should increasingly be Americanized by an excess of American bishops.

We can allude only briefly to one or two of the other matters which engage the anonymous author's attention. To Evangelicals it is, of course, no blinding revelation that "with Canon Law Revision goes Liturgical Revision", but it is none the less a statement heavy with foreboding in view of the definite trend of Canon Law Revision away from the principles of our historic Reformed faith. Thanks to the Presidential Address to last year's Islington Conference, it is now at least clear to the writer of the Preface that Evangelicals will be satisfied with "nothing short of the complete prohibition of Reservation". As readers of our last issue will be aware, we are unable to share in the praise of the proposals of the Liturgical Commission in regard to the services of Baptism and Confirmation as "important and encouraging", and it is certainly not our hope that "their clarity and simplicity will eventually win acceptance". On the contrary, we trust that these proposed new forms of service will be set aside and a new start made along lines which are theologically sound. It is more than time that Conservative Evangelical scholars were invited to serve on the liturgical and theological commissions which are from time to time appointed. They have a contribution to make that is not to be underrated.

And how refreshing it would be to have a George Whitefield writing the Crockford Preface for a change!

P.E.H.

The Spiritual issues of the Reformation

BY GRAHAM WINDSOR

SO closely interrelated were the political, economic, cultural, and religious developments of the early sixteenth century that some historians have denied, and others doubted, the importance of spiritual issues in the Reformation struggle. F. M. Powicke, for instance, says that "the Reformation in England was a parliamentary transaction",¹ and S. C. Carpenter that the first stage of the Reformation was in almost no sense doctrinal.² While both these statements are true, if interpreted rightly, there is considerable evidence from contemporary sources to indicate that it was the search for personal spiritual satisfaction which initiated and sustained the impetus of the significant changes made during the period. It was not because of the influence of Renaissance learning nor because of a patriotic desire to dissolve Roman supremacy over the English Church that Thomas Bilney entered on the road that led to martyrdom. It was because he found for himself, and wished others to find, that God's forgiveness was conditional only upon man's faith. In his own words: "This one sentence (1 Tim. i. 15) did so exhilarate my heart, being before wounded with the guilt of my sins, and being almost in despair, that immediately I felt a marvellous comfort and quietness, insomuch that my bruised bones leaped for joy".³ R. H. Bainton closes his book *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* by examining its effects on politics, economics, and domestic relations, but goes on to comment: "All these (effects) were only by-products. The Reformation was a religious revival. Its attempt was to give man a new assurance in the presence of God and a new motivation in the moral life."⁴

It is worthwhile, however, to assess some of the varying explanations of the Reformation which have been offered. Some have suggested that the whole movement was simply one of the periodic rebellions against economic exploitation, in this case by the Protestants against the Papacy. There is no doubt that during the Middle Ages the papal organization had developed into a vast money-making machine, as procurations, tithes, annates, "provisions," and Peter's Pence flowed into its coffers, and that this was bitterly resented by the laity and clergy alike. But if nothing more had been at stake, it would have been quite possible for Henry VIII to adjust the grievance by a concordat like that yielded to France, especially as Clement VII was in no position to insist upon his so-called rights. The refusal to remain under the pope's spiritual control can hardly be attributed therefore to economic considerations.

Another attempted explanation is that the Reformation was merely the manifestation and culmination of an inner conflict between two ethnic groups—a rebellion by the Teutonic peoples against the dominance of the Latins. This theory has a show of truth, because obviously in the end Protestantism entrenched itself in the north and

Roman Catholicism in the south. Moreover, Protestant theology is sometimes supposed to be more congenial to the tenacious, intellectual rather dogmatic Teutonic approach. In the first place, though, this explanation ignores the persistence of Catholicism in Ireland and its sharing of German territory. Secondly, it does not seem that Roman doctrine is less dogmatic or more spontaneous and intuitive than that of Protestantism. In fact the most celebrated Protestant theological work, Calvin's *Institutes*, is typically swift and supple in the French tradition. The division of the rival churches into rough geographical zones is best explained by the application during the sixteenth century of *cuius regio, eius religio*, and the expulsion and emigration of religious minorities.

On the other hand, the Reformation has been regarded as a chiefly social phenomenon. According to this interpretation, Roman Catholicism remained as the religion of the upper classes, the middle classes turned to Lutheranism and Calvinism, the lower to Anabaptism. This explanation misconceives both the state of society in the sixteenth century and the composition of the religious groups. Firstly, these sharp dividing lines between class and class were a product mainly of the Industrial Revolution, certainly they were not evident in a society which was in many respects medieval and which had only just entered on the growth of capitalism. Secondly, it would be difficult to maintain the thesis that different religions were adopted by different classes, even if these existed. That the Calvinist Huguenots were largely tradesmen is true : but the French peasantry showed little tendency towards Anabaptism. Luther continued to hold the allegiance of peasants even after their abortive rebellion. The Anabaptists themselves owed the meagreness and adversities of their existence not to their low social status but rather to the severity with which they were harried from place to place. Their early leaders came indeed from the burgher intelligentsia. We must beware, too, of mistaking the effects of the Reformation for its causes. For example, the prosperous merchants of Holland in later years were Calvinists, but were they Calvinist because they were merchants, or merchants because they were Calvinists?

Perhaps the most plausible of the alternative explanations is that which attributes the Reformation to nationalistic and political causes. It is certain that for some centuries in England and France, and more recently in Spain, an increased desire for national unity and independence had been shown. The twin leadership of Europe by Church and Empire was being discarded in favour of smaller, more compact units, which were easier to control and possessed enough internal agreement to weld together their divergent elements. It is certain, too, that in England and Scandinavia, and to some extent in Germany, Reformation ideas were used to further political ends. But that the ideas themselves were not the product of nationalism seems equally clear. In Spain, for instance, a fierce patriotic fervour aligned itself with Rome *against* the Protestants. Again, Henry II of France, who was the last king before Henry IV who could decide and execute his own policy, showed scant mercy to the Reformers but equally little consideration for the pope. In Ireland, it was Catholicism which

supported the struggle for national independence, while in Germany the Lutheran princes during the Thirty Years' War were leaning over backwards to preserve the Empire from dissolution. It seems that neither in Protestant nor in Catholic camps was there a fixed predilection for or against a particular form of government, but that their reaction was determined by the circumstances of the time.

Sir Isaac Newton phrased his Second Law of Motion thus : " The rate of change of the quantity of motion in a body is proportional to the impressed force and takes place in the direction of the impressed force." As in the sphere of mechanical science, so in religion is this law true. The impetus and direction of the Reformation can only be explained by a mighty spiritual energy. The greatest movements of world history, judged by both the intensity and the permanence of their effects, are those where the human spirit has been the mainspring. The rise of Communism cannot be adequately explained as an economic, a political, a social development. It is because of its claim to satisfy all human needs, only to exterminate the soul by subtle means, that its proliferation has been so devastating and rapid. Now the Reformation produced many changes in the different spheres of civilized life, but it is in religion that they have been permanent and stable. Different forms of government have arisen and decayed, economic systems have fluctuated, cultural life has sometimes flourished, sometimes faded : new principles, new approaches, have had their influence in every field of human life. But that the spiritual need of Europe in the sixteenth century was adequately satisfied in accordance with the unchanging relationship between man and God is proved by the continued life and vigour of Protestantism. It is, of course, a dynamic, not a static religion ; but while methods and terminology do and must change, the survival of the old principles is a guarantee of the religious validity of the Reformation. So much for the *direction* of the new movement.

To estimate next the amount of " impressed force ", it is necessary to find out the resulting " rate of change " or momentum. To begin with, there was a tremendous acceleration as the Reformation got under way. The ground had been prepared for some time before by the exponents of the New Learning. Apart from the Renaissance scholars like Lorenzo Valla, there were those like Colet of St. Paul's, a pioneer in Biblical exposition, who were concerned with the decadence of the Church. Among these, and influenced himself by Colet, was Erasmus, whose crowning achievement was his edition of the Greek New Testament in 1515. The encouragement he gave to Biblical Study was reinforced by his " Paraphrases " or commentaries, which were eventually placed by royal command in every church in England. But even allowing for the extent to which the Roman Catholic position had been undermined by this fresh scholarship and by earlier dissidents like Wycliffe and Huss, the speed at which Reformed truths spread through Europe after 1517 was sensational. Within twenty years of Luther's attack on indulgences, Protestant national churches had been established in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, England had seceded from her allegiance to the papacy, the powerful Schmalkaldic League of German Lutheran princes had arrayed itself against the Emperor, Calvin had begun his work in Geneva, and the Zwinglians had secured

for themselves a measure of toleration at the Peace of Kappel. This is to speak only of the official recognition accorded to Protestants. Their doctrines had filtered into every land in Europe to some degree. Within fifty years, toleration had been yielded in Poland, and Calvinism established in Scotland. Already there were the beginnings of the storm in France and the Low Countries. In 1598 the Edict of Nantes gave freedom of worship to French Protestants and in 1609 Holland gained her freedom from Catholic Spain. So swift then was the dissemination of the new-found truths, that in less than a century half of Europe had transferred its loyalties to the Protestant faith. The rapid growth of the movement, together with the direction in which its course mainly flowed, are patent indications that its source must have been an overwhelming spiritual force.

* * * *

What was it that brought the Reformers into opposition to the Church of Rome? What were they seeking that seemed so important as to be worth persecution and martyrdom? The opening paragraph of Bishop Jewel's *Apology* provides a clue. In it he conceives the struggle between Christ and Satan as one fought under the aegis of truth and falsehood. "The truth wandereth here and there as a stranger in the world, and doth readily find enemies and slanderers amongst those that know her not."⁵ The lies which constantly oppose the progress of the truth are fathered by the devil. "Nay truly, this might seem much rather a marvel, and beyond all belief, if the devil, who is the father of lies and enemy to all truth, would now upon a sudden change his nature and hope that truth might otherwise be suppressed than by belying it."⁶ Jewel, thinking of Christ, says that "the truth" is the name most fit to express all His divine power.

It would seem, then, that at least one typical Reformer understood the conflict with Rome in terms of truth (Christ) versus falsehood (Satan). His criterion in assessing a doctrine was not "Does it please?" nor even, "Does it satisfy?", nor again, "Is it of long-standing?", but "Is it correct?" Equally Archbishop Cranmer in *The Lord's Supper* claims repeatedly that his aim is "that all should be performed according to its true use."⁷ His favourite description of the Anglican faith is "the true Christian religion" based on "the truth of the Divine Word". Truth it was which mattered above all else to these men. A testimony to the honesty of their search is that although in the early fifteen-twenties Cranmer and Latimer had met at the White Horse Inn in Cambridge to discuss Reformed ideas with, among others, William Tyndale and Robert Barnes, it was years and sometimes decades before they found themselves able to agree entirely with their former friends, already passed on in glory. It was 1546, for instance, before Cranmer came to the true and catholic doctrine and use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. There was no facile acceptance of new doctrines simply because the pupil admired or respected his teacher, no believing for believing's sake. Truth, unless examined and appropriated individually, is tasteless in itself and profitless. The Reformers were convinced, too, that truth is powerful and persuasive. So Cranmer writes: "By which book so many

persons were drawn to a correct opinion that I perceived how great was the power of truth, and understood the benefits of the grace of our Saviour Christ, so that men who had been darkened to the light of truth received the splendour of the light.”⁸

The search for truth was initiated for two reasons : firstly, because men wanted a religion that was adequate for their spiritual need secondly, because they believed it ought also to be intellectually satisfactory. Brought up among and surrounded by all the trappings and accessories of Roman Catholic religion, the Reformers found its system inadequate and largely irrelevant to the problems they felt in their relationship to God. On investigating further, it was found that the system itself was not internally consistent or respectable. Thus spiritual dissatisfaction led to intellectual doubt, and God in His mercy and wisdom supplied the needs of both mind and soul, for His truth provides for the whole man.

It is not every Christian's wish or gift to make public his spiritual history, or at least the details of the encounter with God in Jesus Christ which made him a new creation. Only a little is known, for example, of how Robert Barnes and Hugh Latimer first came to know Christ—through the instrumentality of Thomas Bilney. Of Nicholas Ridley, Thomas Cranmer, William Tyndale, we know even less. There is, however, more to be learned about Bilney's, and indeed of Luther's conversion, the pioneers of the English and German Reformations. In a letter to Bishop Tunstall, Bilney makes it clear that his conversion only came after he had made every endeavour to satisfy his soul by the means provided by the Roman Church, spending not only his money but most of his spiritual strength in so doing. Vigils, fasts, penances, every ordinance prescribed for the consolation of a conscience-stricken sinner, all these were tried by the young priest, and all were found wanting. This experience is an exact parallel to Luther's a few years before. Dr. Wace describes it thus : “ When one great and genuine soul had wrestled with these terrors of conscience for years in a monastery, when the truth had been brought home to the depths of his conscience, by a bitter personal experience, that there was no hope in himself and his own efforts, but that he must look altogether outside himself for forgiveness, the long struggle of the Middle Ages had reached its natural conclusion.”⁹

It is highly significant that the break from Rome, as well in Germany as in England—Foxe calls Bilney “ the first framer of that university (Cambridge) in the knowledge of Christ ”—¹⁰ was made by men who had tasted everything that papal religion had to offer, who had been to every length to prove its claims in their experience, and still had to admit its emptiness. It was not the easily discouraged, but those of spiritual zeal and stamina who found salvation outside the “ one fold ”. This is surely an indication to modern Christians that while forgiveness costs nothing in the way of good works, it is only given to those who are deeply concerned spiritually and really hungry for fellowship with God. There were few, if any, facile conversions in Reformation times. Moreover, spiritual needs always take precedence over the intellectual, and what evidence there is of God's dealings with the Reformers suggests that it was when they had begun to seek for

some greater consolation than the Church could offer that they began to have intellectual doubts as to its authority. Rome was proved wrong first in practice, second in theory.

It was not long after they *felt* that indulgences, penances, Masses, etc., were of no use to the starving soul, that they began to see why. They were preceded, however, in the field of detecting error by a long succession of rebels and critics who had expressed doubts as to the efficacy of such observances. This succession had lately been crowned by the coming of Erasmus. In his *Enchiridion* of 1503 he attacked the Pharisaism of contemporary religious thought. Six years later he spoke of "the clowns who had perverted the ways of Christian love".¹¹ Though he lived and died a bachelor, he "disliked and distrusted the whole edifice of medieval religion, the monks, the friars, the bishops, the ceremonies, and above all indulgences."¹² He complained that a man would choose "rather to venture his salvation upon a skin of parchment than on the amendment of his life".¹³ And this scholar from Rotterdam, "the glory of his age,"¹⁴ was in Cambridge for a full three years shortly before the meetings at the White Horse Inn.

When such renowned teachers, while still devout churchmen, could openly criticize abuses and advocate reform, it is not to be wondered at if those who had also an experience of forgiveness into the bargain soon began to find that the Romish system was not worthy of their intellectual assent. The merciless exposure of Catholic error was carried on especially by Tyndale in the glosses to his translations, but also by word of mouth by Bilney, who preached against images and penances in Norfolk, Miles Coverdale in Essex, Barnes in Cambridge. The first flash of the light of truth had come through the experience of the heart; its radiance was to shine more brightly and widely as chastened but gladdened minds undertook the labour of explaining and propagating the new truths.

* * * *

Reality in religion was the first object of the Reformers' search. It meant acknowledging their utter helplessness to fulfil the commands of God. The Church did not recognize this premise and was unable to offer a solution, and consequently they were driven to the Scriptures, "*flumina aurum volventia*," as Erasmus described them.¹⁵ It is worthy of note, but not of surprise, that enlightenment for both Luther and Bilney came from this source, to the former from the Psalms and Romans, and to the latter from I Timothy. The truth they discovered there was the vehicle of salvation to them, and later to others. It became the rallying-cry for the reform movement and anathema in Catholic ears. Justification by faith is the cardinal point around which the Christian life revolves, and it is the truth of this doctrine which makes it possible for sinful man *actually* to come into contact with God, and not just to flatter himself that he does. Luther put it this way: "Night and day I pondered until I saw the connection between the justice of God and the statement that 'the just shall live by his faith'. Then I grasped that the justice of God is that righteousness by which through grace and sheer mercy God justifies us through faith. Thereupon I felt myself to be reborn and to have gone through open doors

into paradise.”¹⁶ The Augsburg Confession thus : “ We teach that men are freely justified for Christ’s sake, by faith, when they believe that they are received into grace.”¹⁷ The Thirty-Nine Articles thus : “ Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.”¹⁸ By faith only : this *sola fide* was the bone that stuck in Catholic throats, and they took care to add “ and by repentance, hope, and love ” in the recantation which Cranmer was persuaded to sign. When Martin Bucer came to England in 1549 to occupy the chair of divinity at Cambridge, one of the features of church life which pleased him most was that “ the doctrine of justification is purely and soundly taught ”,¹⁹ though its detractors like Gardiner, Master of Trinity Hall, were not yet completely silenced. The doctrine hinges upon the meaning of the two words “ justification ” and “ faith ”.

First, it must be clear that faith is the channel and not the ground of salvation. Dr. Wace elucidates : “ The phrase ‘ justification by faith ’ is really an abbreviated expression of the truth, and is not the phrase originally used by the Reformers in the Confession. They say not that men are justified by faith, but that they are justified for Christ’s sake through faith.”²⁰ It is not because we believe, but because Christ died, that we can enjoy fellowship with God. Faith is not another but superior kind of good work which earns God’s friendliness, but merely a receptivity which has no merit in itself. This receptivity is indeed passive, yet at the same time it is the utmost activity. The paradox is necessarily involved in any contact between infinite God and finite man, and may be paralleled in the following way. Man is freest when he is bound to God, strongest when he feels at his weakest, most his own when to live is Christ. So the minister must urge his hearers to be active in faith, emphasizing meanwhile that faith is to be received as a gift from God. Thus conversion must be shown to be both an *act* of committal and an *attitude* of trust : the separation of the two will lead on the one hand to unstable decisions and quick defections, on the other to complacency and spiritual sclerosis.

Second, it was the Reformers’ conviction that “ to be accounted righteous is not the same thing as to be inherently righteous ” (H. C. Porter).²¹ As Cranmer says in the *Homily of Salvation* (1546) : “ And this justification or righteousness, which we do receive by God’s mercy and Christ’s merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God for our perfect and full justification.”²² Bishop Jewel (*Defence*, p. 582) quotes Augustine’s words : “ Our very righteousness itself is so great in this life, that it standeth rather in forgiveness of our sins than in perfection of righteousness ”;²³ and those of Jerome : “ It is most certain that he enjoyeth full perfection, not of his own deserving, but of grace.”²⁴ This again meant reality in the worship and service of God, when relations between Father and son are without a blemish or a cloud. Fellowship under restraint and with reservations is not fellowship at all—its prerequisite must be confidence and openness. Only the Protestant truth of justification by the Cross can assure us of such a relationship.

The sinner is usually conceived as being righteous by his status and

not by his condition. The process has been criticized as being no more than a legal fiction, but a true appreciation of Christ's identification of himself with sinful man will show this suggestion to be unwarranted. The modern Evangelical must certainly maintain his emphasis on this aspect of the truth, opposing any system which offers salvation by means of a substitute for Christ, to be received by a substitute for faith. Here, as elsewhere, the Christian doctrine is made up of two interlocking parts, representing the activity of God and the response of man. Any substitute for Christ, whether it is ritual, sacraments, churchmanship, or the popular and pernicious alternatives of a harmless life, initiation into esoteric cults, or social progress, must be exposed.

Equally we must stress that faith is not a commodity existing *in vacuo*. Faith should never be separated from its antecedent—the promises of God, nor from its object—the life and death and person of the Lord Jesus Christ. In Jewel's words: "It is our faith that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit. And Origen saith: 'Christ is the priest, the propitiation, and sacrifice; which propitiation cometh to everyone by means of faith'." ²⁵ The operation of faith is thus integrally linked to Jesus and His sacrifice. Such a trust in God's entire satisfaction and His full forgiveness of our sins will produce a bold, joyful, confident Christianity which should be typically Protestant. There is a point at which introspectivity becomes one of the most serious hindrances to Christian life and witness.

This leads on to the second great object of the Reformers' search. Beside reality, the knowledge that religion was not just a vain mumbo-jumbo, they wanted security. Calvin, it is said, had such a sense of security that it never occurred to him to wonder if he was one of the elect. He was quite content to go on doing the will of God, and rather despised those who were worried by the question. Luther was not so serene, for God saw fit to test him with many periods of doubt and depression. He wrote: "If I live longer, I would like to write a book about '*Anfechtungen*', for without them no man can understand Scripture, faith, the fear, or the love of God. He does not know the meaning of hope who was never subject to temptations." ²⁶ All in all, though, the characteristic note of Reformed religion was assurance. Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* witnesses abundantly to this. Anthony Pearson, burnt in 1544, pulled the burning straw on to his head and cried: "This is God's hat; now am I dressed like a true soldier of Christ, by whose merits only I trust this day to enter into His joy." John Bradford encouraged his young fellow-sufferer, John Leaf, with the words: "Be of good comfort, brother: for we shall have a merry supper with the Lord this night." ²⁷ Such assurance sprang principally from three doctrines: the sovereignty of God, the trustworthiness of the Scriptures, the efficacy of the Atonement.

The doctrine of the sovereignty of God was not new in the sense that it was unknown before or that it had been forgotten. It had merely been by-passed and whittled down. From the distinct assertion of Augustine that God controls every part of the universe, theologians through the centuries had managed to find more and more room for human effort, accommodating the truth to man's innate desire to

make himself "like God". Thomas Aquinas, to be sure, did not deny that all power and merit belonged to God, but vaguely hinted that it was now on permanent loan to the Church. In fact, the emergence of a new emphasis in the Roman Church was typical of the medieval period. The honour due to the body of Christ, those whom He energizes and directs, is only the reflected glow of the honour due to Him. Unfortunately there are few errors more common than that of regarding the Church, which should be the principal vehicle of God's glory, as an end in itself, an institution which *must* be preserved for its own sake. It was one of the chief benefits of the Reformation to restore the glorification of God as the motive for all human effort and the end of all creation. The test of ceremony and religious devotion was, "Does it enhance the glory of God?" The watchword of the Reformers became "*solī Deo gloria*". It was the starting-point of Calvin's theology in the *Institutes*—God's power is absolute, and He only is worthy to be praised.

In accordance with this view, whatever was allowed to man's power, or goodness, or intellect, detracted in equal ratio from God's. "The great thing to be attended to," wrote Calvin, "is that God's glory be maintained entire and unimpaired."²⁸ Calvin was the greatest exponent of the revived significance of the doctrine. In his scheme of thought it became not merely a philosophical maxim but a living and motivating principle, the presupposition underlying all Scriptural truth. Notably, however, it was productive and fruitful of Christian character and values wherever it was adequately integrated into a theological synthesis. Where it was not duly prepared for and compensated by other Christian truths, it sometimes led to severe doubt and an unwholesome fear. The new principle was referred to, especially, during the early days, as a guide in what was permissible in Christian worship. Thomas Becon praised Latimer for his attacks on "temple-works, good intents, blind zeal, superstitious devotion, etc.; as the painting of tabernacles, gilding of images, setting up of candles, running on pilgrimage, and such like other idle inventions of men, whereby the glory of God was obscured."²⁹ The pomp and extravagance which earned the Church the contempt of the common man and the denunciation of preachers like Barnes and Bradford were further examples of the extent to which she was usurping the honour due to God alone. There was a violent reaction in Calvinist circles against any ceremony or ornament which was deemed to be superfluous. Many directives in the 1549 Prayer Book offended in this respect. Bucer censured the alb and cope, the sign of the cross at the consecration, anointing in baptism, the blessing of water in the font, etc.³⁰ It was some time, too, before John Hooper could be persuaded to wear surplice and cope at his consecration as Bishop of Gloucester. Such was the zeal of many Reformers to reject anything that might detract from or infringe upon the glory of God.

What may the twentieth century profitably learn from this emphasis? First, we must rediscover the importance of *solī Deo Gloria* as the incentive of the Christian life. It is the believer's duty to live his life to the glory of God, irrespective of whether he finds it hard or easy, rewarding or barren. Second, we must challenge every attempt to

set up the Church, the State, society, or the individual as the be-all and end-all of our efforts. Third, we (and especially those who are concerned with the ordering of worship in the Church of England) must take every precaution lest anything in our services and presentation of the Gospel cast a shadow over the splendour of God's Name. The sooner it is realized that the dingy, the old-fashioned, the crude, the ugly, the immature, the tedious can no longer be tolerated in our churches, the better it will be. If there is to be music in church, let it be good music. If we claim the Bible is the Word of God, let it be read thoughtfully and well. Above all, if the Church gathers to meet the high and lofty One, then let there be manifest a true atmosphere of reverence. The sovereignty of God brings to the believer the security that all the chances and trials of this life are under His control, and, what is more, that he is himself more than their conqueror. The almighty God is involved in the human situation: He can be counted upon as the one stable factor. "The chief end of man," then, "is to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever".

* * * *

What Dr. Wace called "the cardinal principle of the Reformed teaching"³¹ was contained in the third article of the Augsburg Confession, which laid down that our salvation has been achieved for us by Christ alone, in His death, and is applied individually to us by the operation of His Spirit. The cardinal principle is in fact that of the Atonement. It was the second ground of security for the Reformers: God was in supreme control: full provision had been made whereby the sinner could trust that the Almighty power would be exerted on his behalf. It was the meaning of the events on Calvary which suddenly broke out upon Luther from the twenty-second psalm and changed his understanding of the Scriptures. It was the realization why Jesus came which transformed Bilney's reading of the New Testament. If the sovereignty of God was a philosophical assurance of security, then the Atonement was a historical one. The prayer of consecration in the Holy Communion service is largely a record of the historical events by which Almighty God gave His "only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world".³² In no more emphatic terms could the uniqueness and eternal sufficiency of the Cross be affirmed. Faith does not operate on anything but the saving acts of God. Calvary is Biblical history, that is, fact plus significance—and this dual aspect of the truth, when appropriated by faith, is God's meeting-place with men. Belief in the sacrifice of Christ was then, as it should be now, the key-note of the preacher's message. John Bradford urged his hearers: "The matter hangeth not on thy worthiness, but it hangeth on God's truth. Clap hold on it; and I warrant thee Christ is 'the propitiation for our sins, yea, for the sins of the whole world'".³³

The two chief aspects of the Atonement which created controversy in the sixteenth century, were the sufficiency and the uniqueness of the death of Christ. The first was spot-lighted in the Augsburg Con-

fession : " a Sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men ".³⁴ They complained that there was a widely-held opinion that the Cross dealt only with original guilt and that daily sins were taken away by the Mass. The Reformers were always careful for the honour of Christ, that nothing—Mass, penance, absolution, or purgatory—should be allowed to be added to the Atonement in the work of remission of sins. Such a certainty gave Tyndale the assurance to write : " We have a promise that Christ, and His body, and His blood, and all that He did, and suffered, is a sacrifice, a ransom, and a *full* satisfaction for our sins ; that God for His sake will think no more on them, if we have power to repent and believe."³⁵ Here is a salutary reminder that the Reformers took no narrow view of the Atonement. Tyndale conceives the whole person and work of Christ as the basis of God's forgiveness—and yet the Cross was so far the essence and climax of Christ's appearing that it may fitly be used to sum up the whole work. So Cranmer : " Only the death of Christ " is " the oblation, satisfaction, and price, wherefor our sins be pardoned."³⁶ The present-day Christian must continue in this faith, that the only ground of God's forgiveness is through the death of Christ, for original sin, for sins committed before and after conversion, for the sins of those who have never heard of Christ. Never does repentance, sacrament, or " living according to the light ", erase the barrier between us and God.³⁷

Whether Christ died once for all was a fruitful source of controversy then as now. Ridley speaks of " Christ's blessed body and blood, which was once only offered and shed upon the cross ".³⁸ This was the truth which Cranmer expounded and defended so well in *The Lord's Supper*, that " if Christ had made any oblation for sin more than once, He should have died more than once ".³⁹ Without contradicting the clear words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Romanists could not deny that " the sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was never reiterate " (so Gardiner⁴⁰). Yet they maintained that the Mass was a sacrifice. " The papists to excuse themselves do say, that they make no new sacrifice : but that they make the self-same sacrifice for sin that Christ made " (Cranmer⁴¹). This means, if taken literally, " that they every day slay Christ and shed His blood ".⁴² Cranmer quoted with approval Peter Lombard's words : " That which is offered and consecrated of the priest, is called a sacrifice, because it is a memory and representation of the true sacrifice made in the altar of the Cross."⁴³ The important word " representation " is defined as a " memory ", and not " re-presentation ". Clear thinking will show that if the Lord's Supper is a re-presentation, it is to crucify Christ again. Coverdale wrote : " It is not said that Christ was once offered up to the Father, that other should afterward use the same oblation, that they might apply unto us the force of His intercession. As concerning the application of the merit of His death, that we may feel the fruit thereof, that is done, not after such sort as they of the popish church think it to be done ; but when we receive the tidings of the gospel."⁴⁴ What is needed in sacramental controversy today is a clear head. The Reformers dealt with every debated point that has since arisen. Their example of exhaustive argument and definition of terms must be

adhered to if we are to expose false doctrine as successfully as they did. Their motive, too, must be recaptured or preserved—that the truth of the Atonement must be vindicated not to prove we are in the right, or to maintain for ourselves a foothold in the Church of England, but to keep unblemished the glory due to Christ our Saviour and to help in His search for those who are lost. Only if we realize how wonderfully sufficient our Saviour is, can we be secure in the knowledge that, on sin, God has spoken His final word.

The third bastion which lent the Reformers security against doubt and fear was the trustworthiness of the Bible. By it they were assured of the accuracy of their knowledge of God and particularly of Jesus. Again it was a doctrine which, while held in theory, had long since ceased to have a vital effect on man's religion. And not surprisingly it was when its revival made it once more a significant force that it was doubted, challenged, and distorted. For the Reformers, the Bible was first of all the Word of God. Its inspiration is thus declared by Jewel: "these (the canonical Scriptures) be the heavenly voices, whereby God hath opened unto us his will; that in them be abundantly and fully comprehended all things, whatsoever be needful for our salvation"⁴⁵; and elsewhere: "the judgment of the Holy Scriptures, that is to say, the judgment of God Himself."⁴⁶ As is the author, so is the authority. The Word of God replaced the Church as the arbiter of truth; it is "the very sure and infallible rule, whereby may be tried, whether the Church doth stagger or err."⁴⁷ Tyndale calls it "the touchstone that trieth all doctrines",⁴⁸ and it was to this court of appeal that Cranmer brought the question of the Lord's Supper: "so the contention on both parties may be quieted and ended, the most sure and plain way is to cleave unto holy Scripture, wherein whatsoever is found, must be taken for a most sure ground and an infallible truth."⁴⁹

We must notice the stress that is laid by the Reformers on the continuity of Protestantism with true Catholicism, especially noticeable in the Confession of Augsburg but also in Cranmer's *The Lord's Supper* and Ridley's *Disputation at Oxford*. Cranmer deals extensively with evidence drawn from the Fathers, asseverating frequently that the papists are condemned in that their doctrine contradicts both the Scriptures and the "old doctors" or "ancient authors" of the undivided Church.⁵⁰ Ridley's determination to retain as many of the old authors as possible was shown when he was challenged with a text from St. Bernard. "I know that Bernard was in such a time, that in this matter he may worthily be suspected. Notwithstanding yet I will so expound him, rather than reject him, that he shall make nothing for you at all."⁵¹ The Reformers, then, fled all appearance of novelty, and paid great respect to the opinions of previous theologians. Yet, in the last resort they would maintain the right of private judgment.

The third quality of religious life which the Reformers desired, and found to be Scriptural and necessary, was freedom. It depended on, or rather was interrelated with, the reality and the security which they derived from God's presence and truth, and affected especially their new life as Christians. It may be said that false religion always brings bondage, and wherever there is bondage, there is superstition and lack of holiness.

The discovery of freedom meant two things : freedom from undue ceremonial ; freedom to do good works. So Coverdale writes : " Thus do we perceive that this multitude of ceremonies which is seen in the mass is utterly contrary to the Christian religion. (Yet) I am not of that mind, that I would disprove (reject) all ceremonies which do serve to honesty and public order ".⁵² The Christian life no longer meant being religious, but doing the will of God in the place of His choice. So Becon : " But unto what good works is the faithful created in Christ ? Unto Rome-running ? gadding on pilgrimage ? setting-up of candles ? gilding of images ? painting of tabernacles ? building of monasteries ? purchasing of pardons ? " ⁵³ Many non-Christians, and Christians too, still think of " following Christ " or " full-time service " as entering the ministry. A work-mate in an engineering shop recently said, " It's all very well to follow Christ, but some of us have to go to work ! " Let Coverdale's words be better heeded and taught : " Our duty is no more but to trust and believe in Him, and to serve in that vocation and condition of life, whereunto we are called and appointed of God, faithfully. " ⁵⁴ Christian freedom, regained by the Reformers, must not become bound again by twentieth-century religiosity.

" What is truth ? " Pilate's question was answered in the minds of Luther and his successors. True religion produced reality, security freedom, held in equipoise between their basis in theoretical doctrine and their outcome in practical living. Everything that is Christ-like is founded on the truth ; therefore the truth was their goal. For it their spirits longed, and from it they produced a quality of religious life rarely equalled since. If we are to enjoy a religion without hypocrisy (play-acting), without bondage to others or ourselves, which is confident in its certainty, let us beseech God to create in us spirits that thirst for the truth.

¹ F. M. Powicke : *The Reformation in England* (1941), p. 34.

² S. C. Carpenter : *The Church in England, 597-1688* (1954), p. 216.

³ Letter to Tunstall, quoted in M. L. Loane, *Masters of the English Reformation* (1954), p. 7.

⁴ R. H. Bainton : *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (1953), p. 261.

⁵ John Jewel : *Apology of the Church of England* (1562) (Parker Soc., Vol. 30), p. 52.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Thomas Cranmer : *The Lord's Supper* (1550) (Protestant Truth Soc., 1907), p. xix.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ H. Wace : *Principles of the Reformation* (1910), p. 45.

¹⁰ John Foxe : *Acts and Monuments*, IV, p. 651.

¹¹ Erasmus : *Praise of Folly*, LIV, in H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (1958), p. 25.

¹² Carpenter : *op. cit.*, p. 204.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Henry Bullock : in Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

¹⁵ Erasmus : *Epistolae*, I, 352, in Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

¹⁶ Bainton : *op. cit.* p. 49.

- ¹⁷ In Wace : *op. cit.*, p. 50.
- ¹⁸ Article XI.
- ¹⁹ Porter : *op. cit.*, p. 63.
- ²⁰ Wace : *op. cit.*, p. 56.
- ²¹ Porter : *op. cit.*, p. 62.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ Jewel : *Defence of the Apology*, p. 582.
- ²⁴ Jewel : *Apology*, p. 64.
- ²⁵ Bainton : *op. cit.*, p. 283.
- ²⁶ In Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 244.
- ²⁷ Porter : *op. cit.*, p. 72.
- ²⁸ Calvin : *Institutes*, III, xiii, 12.
- ²⁹ Thomas Becon : *Catechism*, p. 425 in Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
- ³⁰ Cf. Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
- ³¹ Wace, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
- ³² Book of Common Prayer, the Lord's Supper.
- ³³ John Bradford : Parker Soc., Vol. 32, p. 68.
- ³⁴ In Wace, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
- ³⁵ William Tyndale : Parker Soc., Vol. 38, p. 278.
- ³⁶ Cranmer : *op. cit.*, p. 239.
- ³⁷ Cf. Article XVIII.
- ³⁸ Nicholas Ridley : Parker Soc., Vol. I, p. 12.
- ³⁹ Cranmer : *op. cit.*, p. 237.
- ⁴⁰ Gardiner : in Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 314.
- ⁴¹ Cranmer : *op. cit.*, p. 241.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ Lombard : in Cranmer, *op. cit.*, p. 250.
- ⁴⁴ Miles Coverdale : Parker Soc., Vol. 15, p. 452.
- ⁴⁵ Jewel : *op. cit.*, p. 62.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 58.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- ⁴⁸ Tyndale : *op. cit.*, p. 398.
- ⁴⁹ Cranmer : *op. cit.*, p. 3.
- ⁵⁰ E.g. Cranmer : *op. cit.*, p. 111.
- ⁵¹ Ridley : *op. cit.*, p. 217.
- ⁵² Coverdale : *op. cit.*, p. 460.
- ⁵³ Becon : *op. cit.*, p. 81.
- ⁵⁴ Coverdale : *op. cit.*, p. 165.

Anglican Evangelical Views of the Bible, 1800-1850

BY ARTHUR POLLARD

AT first sight the reader may wonder whether there is really anything to be said on the subject of this paper. Surely the Evangelicals believed the Bible, every word of it, and there is no more to it than that. Surely, all of them, as Bishop J. C. Ryle asserted of some, "taught constantly the *sufficiency and supremacy of the Holy Scripture*. The Bible, whole and unmutilated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. . . . They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God".¹ Moreover, in believing every word, they were not unlike the orthodox in general. Reacting to the publication of *Essays and Reviews* a century ago, Dean Burgon declared: "The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it (where are we to stop?), every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High."² The position of the Evangelicals is not, however, as simple as it may seem. There are interesting individual differences and there are significant reactions to differences in the climate of theological thought.

* * * *

The first of the Anglican Evangelicals whom we must consider is Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford (1747-1821), the commentator. Scott's spiritual autobiography, *The Force of Truth* (1779), recounts his remarkable progress of religious opinion as Socinian, Pelagian, Arminian, and, finally, under the influence of John Newton, moderate Calvinist. He wrote against Tom Paine on the one hand (*Vindication of the Inspiration of Scripture, etc., against Paine*, 1796), and Pretyman-Tomline, the Bishop of Lincoln on the other (*Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's Refutation of Calvinism*, 1812). His great work, however, was the *Commentary* which was first published in 1796 and went through five editions in Scott's lifetime.

Scott's preface to the *Commentary* is the classic statement of the Evangelical position on our subject. He begins with the assumption that man needs a revelation and that God alone can give it. He then goes on to assert the divine inspiration of Scripture, as distinct from its mere genuineness or authenticity. There follows a statement on the nature of inspiration which must be quoted at length:

"Such a complete and immediate communication, by the Holy Spirit, to the minds of the sacred writers, of those things which could not have been otherwise known; and such an effectual superintendency as to those particulars, concerning which they might otherwise obtain

information, as sufficed absolutely to preserve them from every degree of error in all things which could in the least affect any of the doctrines or precepts contained in their writings, or mislead any person who considered them as a divine and infallible standard of truth and duty. Every sentence in this view must be considered as 'the sure testimony of God', in that sense in which it is proposed as truth. Facts occurred, and words were spoken, as to the import of them, and the instruction contained in them, exactly as they stand here recorded; but the morality of words and actions recorded merely as spoken and done, must be judged of by the doctrinal and preceptive parts of the same book. . . . (The authors) wrote, indeed, in such language, as their different talents, educations, habits, and associations suggested, or rendered natural to them; but the Holy Spirit so entirely superintended them, when writing, as to exclude every improper expression, and to guide them to all those which best suited their several subjects."³

Probable though it may appear from this quotation, Scott was not an adherent of the doctrine of the total infallibility of Scripture. He did admit some few errors and interpolations. He was, for instance, doubtful about the Trinitarian insertion, I John v. 7, although he would have preferred to believe that it had been, not inserted, but restored after being omitted by the Arians.

There are five points to note in Scott's statement. They are as follows :

1. The importance he attaches to the work of the Holy Spirit, who not only communicated, but also superintended the whole process of composition.
2. Scott's view, however, was in no sense "Apollinarian". He believed that there was a definite divine-human encounter, and that the individuality of the writer is to be found in the books of Scripture.
3. But he held a very high doctrine of inspiration. "Every sentence . . . must be considered as 'the sure testimony of God'."
4. He stressed, however, that this must be considered in relation to "that sense in which it is proposed as truth". By this it must not be assumed that Scott was in any way either a medieval allegorizer or a "*Bultmannische*" demythologizer. Fanciful and sophisticated interpretation he avoided, but he did see that some books were not factual. Prophecy he read as prophecy, poetry as poetry; and whilst some of his associations, such as, for example, his identification of the "little horn" of Daniel vii. 8 with, and his application of Revelation xvii to, the Church of Rome may not now be so confidently accepted as they were in his own day, he could recognize real allegory when he saw it. For him the Song of Solomon was the dramatizing of the experience of Christ the Bridegroom and the Church His bride.
5. Lastly, Scott emphasized that what mattered principally was not fact, but doctrine and precept. Like all the Evangelicals, he was essentially practical.

The preface moves from the discussion of inspiration to that of authenticity. Here Scott alleged in support of his argument the testimony of centuries of acceptance, the agreement of the sacred writers among themselves, the miracles (the published reports coming so soon after their accomplishment represented in Scott's view "a public challenge to every man to contradict or disprove them"⁴), fulfilled prophecy, the uniqueness of the Bible in its record of "the infinite God speaking in a manner worthy of Himself"⁵ the moral tendency of the Scriptures, the "*actual effects produced . . . (which) evince their divine original*"⁶ "Brevity . . . so connected with fulness . . . that they are a treasure of divine knowledge which can never be exhausted,"⁷ and, lastly, "'He that believeth hath the witness in himself'"⁸ These arguments are not fundamentally different from, though perhaps more extensive than, those produced by many another apologist of the period.

Finally, in the preface there are the remarks about reception of the revelation. Here faith is supreme, with reason as a necessary assistant. But Scott is his own best interpreter here, and two quotations will suffice. First: "Faith, receiving and appropriating the testimony of God, is to reason, not unlike what the telescope is to the eye of the astronomer who by it discerns objects invisible to all others, and sees clearly and distinctly those things which to others appear obscure and confused"⁹; and, secondly: "The province of reason . . . in respect of revelation, is, first, to examine and decide (with modesty and caution) on the evidence by which it is supported; to understand and explain the language in which it is conveyed; to discern in many things the excellency of the things revealed to us, and to use them as motives, encouragements and rules of obedience: and, in things evidently mysterious, to bow in humble submission to the divine teaching; to receive in adoring faith and love what we cannot comprehend; to rest satisfied with what is revealed; and to leave secret things with God, to whom they alone belong."¹⁰

A word is required about Scott as a commentator. He believed that every passage of the Bible had its own distinct meaning. His method of finding it was by making Scripture a commentary upon itself. As Sir James Stephen remarked, Scott brought "no exact knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, no familiarity with the literature or languages of modern Europe, no patristic or medieval learning, no mastery of any moral or political science, and no penetrating critical acumen"¹¹ to his task. In rejecting so much lay Scott's weakness. It meant that his reader has either to reject all that Scott rejected or else to reject much of Scott himself. But therein also lay Scott's strength, namely, what Stephen calls the "saturation of the comment by the spirit of the text",¹² a procedure based on the premises that "God is truth, and His word is truth, and all truth must be consistent with itself".¹³ Scott's Commentary is a vast performance, within its limits sound and of deep spiritual value, but also very dull.

* * * *

Scripture interpreting itself appealed also to Charles Simeon (1759-1836), among Evangelicals especially but also in the Church as a whole

clarum et venerabile nomen.¹⁴ From 1789 to his death over fifty years later he always used "The Self-Interpreting Bible, with explanatory Contents, parallel Scriptures, large Notes and practical Observations, by John Brown, Minister of the Gospel at Haddington; printed in 1778".¹⁵ In other ways also he resembled Scott. He appealed to miracles and prophecy as proofs, and his description of authorship is not unlike that of Scott. He laid great stress upon the supremacy of the Spirit. The Scriptures "were indeed written by men; but men were only the agents and instruments that God made use of: they wrote only what God by His Spirit dictated to them: so that, in reality, the whole Scripture was as much written by the finger of God as the laws were, which He inscribed on two tables of stone, and delivered to His servant Moses".¹⁶ But, as H. D. McDonald has written, "the activity of the writer was not lost in the action of God".¹⁷ The authors were not just "pens", they were also "pen-men". They were preserved by the Spirit from error, but they nevertheless "express themselves in their own way".¹⁸

We must be careful to notice what Simeon means by "error". Simeon was a literalist ("This *literal* method of explication is very justly accounted the *best* way of interpreting Scripture"¹⁹ he declared), but he did not just accept words; he weighed them and gave them their due importance and essential meaning. In his instruction on sermon-composition he stressed the need to grasp "the *sense*, the *character* and the *spirit* of (the) text".²⁰ To the young man who asked him "whether we're to take literally 'which rock followed them'? ", Simeon replied, "Oh yes . . . of course, with a hop, skip and a jump".²¹ Both dull verbalists and fantastic novelty-hunters were the objects of his derision. Error begins in a wrong attitude to words. The uncritical and the un-self-critical are likely to be among its first victims. The proper employment of God-given intellectual powers may, however, find error in the Bible. Simeon was not dismayed by this. Had his own attitude been held more firmly and displayed more widely, the consternation which the Church expressed when Higher Criticism attacked the Scriptures might well have been less great. At one of his conversation-parties he declared: "No error in doctrine or other important matter is allowed; yet there are inexactnesses in references to philosophical and scientific matters, because of its popular style".²² Two points are noticeable about this last phrase. One is its hint of Simeon's recognition of the historical situations in which the books of Scripture were written, and the other is his awareness of the general, as distinct from the specialist, audience at which the Bible is directed. The passage as a whole, however, is principally important in its demonstration of a characteristic trait, Simeon's insistence upon the significance of essentials. Keep the faith and leave the details.

Simeon was no friend to systematizers because they were unable to keep the faith in its totality. He bade his readers to "be Bible Christians, and not system Christians".²³ In a sermon on "The Perfection and Sanctity of the Holy Scriptures"²⁴, preached on Revelation xxii. 18, 19, he declared: "It is at our peril to change or modify any part of that system which God has revealed in his word." What

mattered to him was God's system with its paradoxes, not man's with its schematizations. Hence he could not accept either the Calvinist doctrine of irresistible grace or the Arminian of man's free will.²⁵ Or, to be more exact, he accepted both and held them in tension. He did not pretend to be able to reconcile them. For him "Christianity is altogether a mystery".²⁶ No merely notional assent is therefore sufficient. At a time when orthodoxy rested so strongly upon intellectual conviction, this was a valuable stress. Simeon emphasized the essential activity of the Holy Spirit. "It is not the Word that does good : but the Holy Spirit by the Word."²⁷ That is what matters, but what we must not infer from this is that Simeon despised reason and intellect. He did not ; he used them, but he kept them strictly within the province of their competence.

Reason showed him, for instance, the nonsense of eschatological crystal-gazing, that application of prophecy to contemporary events as allegedly indicative of the approaching end of all things. It was a favourite pastime among some Evangelicals of the time. It accounted for some of the prophetic conferences in which a few Evangelicals, among them Simeon's friend, William Marsh, and Hugh McNeile of Liverpool, were found side by side with the later Pentecostalist, Edward Irving. Marsh indeed, by his incessant preaching on the topic became known as "Millennial Marsh", and another of Simeon's friends, E. B. Elliott, became famous by his *Horæ Apocalypticæ*.²⁸ Such activity Simeon dismissed as the work of "a curious and inquisitive mind".²⁹ Simeon would not have approved, either, of that Biblical variant of the *sortes Virgilianæ*, a somewhat amusing example of which is provided by the admittedly eccentric Berridge. He is writing of March 1770 when he was contemplating marriage : "Falling down on my knees before a table with a Bible between my hands I besought the Lord to give me a direction ; then, letting the Bible fall open of itself, I fixed my eyes immediately on these words, ' When my son was entered into his wedding chamber, he fell down and died ' (2 Esdras x. 1). This frightened me heartily you may easily think ; but Satan who stood peeping at my elbow, not liking the heavenly caution, presently suggested a scruple that the Book was apocryphal, and the words not to be heeded." Berridge therefore tried a second time and was rewarded with Jeremiah xvi. 2. The prohibition was absolute and the authority irreproachable. "I was now completely satisfied," he writes.³⁰ Simeon revered the Word of God too much to use it as a kind of dip-tub for domestic crises. As his disciple, the founder of the Islington Conference and the Lord's Day Observance Society, Bishop Wilson of Calcutta remarked, he was "one of the most truly scriptural" divines.³¹

* * * *

Daniel Wilson is, in fact, the next writer we must consider. The two volumes of his *Evidences of Christianity* (1828 and 1830) in some respects repeat the views of his predecessors. In Lectures VII to XI, for example, we have the usual arguments in favour of the truth of Scripture, and we also find him insisting upon the extensive superintendence of the Holy Spirit whilst maintaining the independence of

the writers. His work, however, is important in three ways, first for its acceptance of the contribution of scholarship, secondly for its instruction on methods of interpretation, and thirdly for its theory of inspiration.

First, in scholarship Wilson, by contrast with the self-interpreters we have so far discussed, enlists the help of Jewish and heathen writers, especially Josephus, in establishing the "credibility of Gospel history". What is more important, however, is his acknowledgment of his indebtedness to recent scholarship, and not just to evidence-writers like Paley, but also to High Churchmen like Horsley and van Mildert, and, most interesting of all, to the pioneer textual scholars, Michaelis and Marsh. Herbert Marsh, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and later Bishop of Peterborough, was one of the few English theologians who knew much German. In 1793 he published an annotated edition of Michaelis's *Introduction to the New Testament*, and in 1801 his *Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of the Three first Canonical Gospels*. In this he propounded the theory of a common Hebrew source with Greek translation for the three synoptic gospels, of which he suggested Matthew was first written in Hebrew, the others in Greek. He then went on to propose that the Greek translators of Matthew received help from Mark, and where there is nothing in common with Mark, they used Luke.³² Marsh was attacked for his theory, but not by Evangelicals. They only objected later to his opposition to the Bible Society. His most notable antagonist was Thomas Randolph, Bishop of Oxford, who asserted that the evangelists had now become "mere copiers of copyists, the compilers from former compilations, from a farrago of gospels, or parts of gospels, of unknown authority every one of them". There is no indication in the *Evidences of Christianity* as to whether Wilson used or even approved of this particular book by Marsh. He may have been referring to help received from some of Marsh's *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*, or to other books on the provenance of Biblical texts. Another Evangelical, the first of them to become Archbishop of Canterbury, J. B. Sumner, quoted approvingly from Marsh's *The Authenticity of the Five Books of Moses vindicated* in his *Treatise on the Records of the Creation* (1816). There Sumner wrote that "the account of the creation given by Moses, does not profess to furnish anything like a systematic or elaborate detail of the mode in which the materials of the earth were brought to their actual form and situation".³³ What mattered, he claimed, was the need to insist on three points: the revelation of God as Creator, the preceding chaos, and at a period not exceeding 5,000 years ago the divinely-executed inundation of the earth.³⁴ The importance of the references to Marsh lies in the fact that, though he was known as a pioneer textual critic of the Bible, Evangelicals did not feel it necessary either to enter into controversy with him or to refuse to make use of his findings. It is a testimony to their judgment and discrimination.

A similar attitude informs Wilson's methods of Biblical interpretation. "All parts of Scripture are to be received," he wrote. "They are all of equal authority, though not all of equal importance."³⁵ He pointed out, valuably, that the meaning is not to be forced and that

the simplest sense is generally the true one.³⁶ He stressed that the occasion, the historical position, the "temporary, local, and extraordinary" as it applied, for instance, to Old Testament Covenants, must always be taken into account.³⁷ He also insisted that the figurative and poetical parts should be interpreted as such.³⁸ These in his opinion include parts of the Mosaic writings, Isaiah, David, the parables of our Lord, the Proverbs, and the poetical imagery of the Canticles and Job.

Last and most interesting of Wilson's ideas on our subject is his theory of inspiration, for which he was perhaps indebted in some measure to van Mildert's *Inquiry into the General Principles of Scripture Interpretation*.³⁹ Wilson suggested that the degree of divine inspiration varies with the matter, the inspiration of suggestion for prophecy, historical facts beyond human knowledge, and for the great statements on doctrine and practice, the inspiration of direction for history, that of elevation for rebuke, exhortation, and the like, and that of superintendency for incidental matters.⁴⁰ These differing types of inspiration are then defined. By that of suggestion Wilson indicates that the Holy Spirit "suggested and dictated minutely every part of the truths delivered"; by that of direction the Spirit left the writers to describe the matter revealed in their own way, directing only the mind in the exercise of its powers; by that of elevation the Spirit is considered as giving "greater strength and vigour to the efforts of the mind than the writers could otherwise have attained"; and, finally, by that of superintendency is meant the Spirit's "watchful care which preserved generally from anything being put down derogatory to the revelation with which it was connected".⁴¹ In all this, of course, it will be evident that Wilson assumed the activity of reason and intellect in distinguishing the different quality of the various passages.

To move on now to 1847 and to the Bampton Lectures of that year delivered, or part delivered for he died during the course, by Walter Augustus Shirley, Bishop of Sodor and Man, on *The Supremacy of the Holy Scriptures*. This work possesses a two-fold significance. First, as Dr. McDonald has remarked, Shirley "can be said to anticipate the work of the more recent Form Criticism"⁴² in his clear recognition that Christ revealed God's will "by oral teaching and did not during His personal ministration dictate any written document",⁴³ and that the message first spoken by the Lord was "for several years . . . verbally handed on and confirmed to the faithful by those who heard him".⁴⁴ Secondly, Shirley's work is important as an Evangelical statement about authority and divine communication in the context of the Tractarian Movement. There are references to Manning's *The Rule of Faith*⁴⁵ and to those who explain inconsistency in the supposed infallible Church's pronouncement at various times by resort to a theory of development, which, says Shirley, "takes away all fixedness of doctrines, and requires a constant inspiration, completely superseding the written record we possess of the faith once delivered to the saints".⁴⁶ That is why, as his title indicates, Shirley contends for the supremacy of the Scriptures as "the one rule of faith and practice . . . the only divine record we possess, and the one standard of truth

and error, to which all must appeal, and by which all may be guided into truth".⁴⁷

Finally, we return to the name of John Charles Ryle. He, like Shirley and those of whom he himself wrote, also "taught constantly the sufficiency and supremacy of the Holy Scripture". This, Ryle said, was "the first leading feature in Evangelical Religion".⁴⁸ In an era of sometimes undisciplined intellectual speculation about the Bible, Ryle clung to the conservative view of Scripture, rejecting those allegedly "clever, liberal, scientific" theologians who dared to dismiss the Bible as "an uninspired, imperfect, defective Book" at variance with "modern thought".⁴⁹ The excesses of some early Higher Criticism provoked in Ryle and his fellows a reaction, all the more uncompromising for what it had to oppose. Over-simplified and even prejudiced as Ryle's views may appear, to him and others like-minded with him the current resurgence of Biblical theology is, in some part, indebted. They defended Scripture as the Word of God against the assaults that in their day came thick and fast upon it.

What conclusions may we draw? First, they stood upon this single foundation—the Bible is supreme. Nothing else may be set beside it. Moreover, it is not just authentic; it is inspired, the God-given testimony. It declares the mind of God on the things which matter, namely, doctrine and precept. They were sometimes diverted, not always remembering their Matthew Henry, that "the Scriptures were written not to make us astronomers, but to make us saints",⁵⁰ but the very passion with which they contended for often indefensible positions derived from their highest virtue, their clear recognition that their "great object as Christian teachers" was "to bring men back to the Bible as the record which God has given them, and by which they must be judged at the last day".⁵¹

¹ *The Christian Leaders of the Last Century*, 1873, p. 26. Quoted by H. D. McDonald, *Ideas of Revelation (1700-1860)*, 1959, p. 212, a useful book on the whole question of revelation in this period.

² Quoted by Alan Richardson, *Preface to Bible Study*, p. 25.

³ Preface, reprinted as *Introduction to the Study of the Bible*, Hatchards, 1881, p. 13.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

¹¹ *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, 3rd ed. 1853, II, p. 139.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 144.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

¹⁴ S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People, 1789-1889*, 1933, p. 26.

¹⁵ Simeon's copy is now in the Library of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁶ *Horæ Homileticæ*, 1833. Sermon 2133.

¹⁷ *Ideas of Revelation*, 1959, p. 231.

¹⁸ Simeon, *op. cit.*, Vol. XIX, p. 72, Sermon 2257.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXI, p. 330.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXI, p. 307.

²¹ Letter of C. W. Lohr to Bp. Handley Moule, quoted in *Let Wisdom Judge: University Addresses and Sermon Outlines*, ed. Pollard 1959, p. 16.

²² W. W. Brown, *Recollections of the Conversation-Parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, 1863, p. 100.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

²⁴ Sermon 2535.

²⁵ See, e.g., Preface to *Horæ Homileticæ*, p. xxv.

²⁶ *Horæ Homileticæ*, Vol. II, p. 105, Sermon 165.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 284, Sermon 1204.

²⁸ On this subject see G. W. E. Russell, *A Short History of the Evangelical Movement*, 1915, pp. 77-79.

²⁹ W. Carus, *Simeon*, 1847, p. 460.

³⁰ Works, pp. 508f.

³¹ Carus, *op. cit.*, p. 847.

³² See V. F. Storr: *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century: 1800-60*, 1913, p. 184.

³³ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 269.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, p. 272.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 510.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, II, pp. 490, 510.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, II, p. 491.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, II, p. 495.

³⁹ The Bampton Lectures of 1814.

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 505-8.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 508, Note.

⁴² McDonald, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

⁴³ Shirley, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁵ *E.g.*, p. 19.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁴⁸ *Knots Untied*, ed. C. S. Carter, 31st edn., 1954, p. 10.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁵⁰ Quoted by R. Abba, *The Nature and Authority of the Bible*, 1958, p. 306.

⁵¹ Shirley, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

Christianity and the Problem of Origins

BY THE EDITOR

IN principle the philosophers of antiquity do not after all appear to have been so wrong-headed in postulating some single universal element as the essence of all things, even though they were mistaken in the substances to which they variously assigned this dignity. Of the presocratic Ionian philosophers, for example, Thales believed that water was the elementary substance of the material order, for since it was known to exist under different conditions not only in fluid but also in gaseous and solid forms it therefore seemed to be qualified to play the part of the universal material. Anaximenes, however, judged air to be the primordial substance, explaining the different densities of things, from wind and fire to stones, as the result of the differing degrees of rarefaction or condensation of the air from which they were supposedly formed. Anaximander, another early Ionian, also maintained that there is a primitive stuff of things, but that it was "neither water nor any other of the so-called elements, but a nature different from them and infinite, from which arise all the heavens and the worlds within them", and which he called "the limitless" (τὸ ἄπειρον). The Ephesian sage Heraclitus thought that he had discovered the primary substance in fire, which consumes all things and appears to change them into itself. Then Empedocles of Sicily propounded the view that there are four distinct elements, namely, earth, air, fire, and water, which by their intermixture give rise to all that is in the world. This view met with the approval of Aristotle.

I say that these ancient seekers after wisdom would seem not to have been *in principle* mistaken in believing that there was some elemental substance of which all things that exist in our world are compounded, for the amazing advances in scientific knowledge of our day appear to have put an end to the atomistic and monadic speculations of all the past centuries, and we may accept the confident assurance of contemporary physicists that the basic element of the physical world is in fact hydrogen.

But though this discovery may be regarded as the end of a chapter in the history of science (in the fundamental sense of the term), it is very far from being the end of this particular book. Indeed, it has brought us to the threshold of a completely new chapter, replete with fresh mysteries to be investigated, which is opening up before us a vista of the structure of our physical universe full of hitherto unimagined wonder. For a considerable time now it has been known that the uncountable variety of entities, both animate and inanimate, with which we are surrounded may be simplified to the extent that they are composed in varying degrees of complexity of a comparatively small

number of chemically irreducible elements or "atoms" (as they were hopefully but mistakenly called), and that these atoms in combination with each other form molecules. More recent research, however, has shown that atoms themselves have a structure of energy which is described in terms of a central nucleus and its encircling electrons, and that in the binding together of atoms to form molecules, and again of different molecules to each other, electro-magnetic forces play a decisive part. Each atomic nucleus in turn is composed of one or more protons and neutrons, of which each proton is in fact the hydrogen nucleus. We have, indeed, as Werner Heisenberg, the distinguished Director of the Max Planck Institute for Atomic Physics in Göttingen, has pointed out, "reached a description of matter in which, instead of the many different chemical elements, only three fundamental units occur: the proton, the neutron, and the electron. All matter consists of atoms and therefore is constructed from these three fundamental building stones" (*Physics and Philosophy*, London, 1959, p. 137).

But there remains what Heisenberg calls "the final problem", namely, the question of the unity of matter. "Are these fundamental building stones—proton, neutron, and electron—final indestructible units of matter, atoms in the sense of Democritus, without any relation except for the forces that act between them or are they just different forms of the same kind of matter?" he asks. "Can they again be transmuted into each other and possibly into other forms of matter as well?" The answer to this question is being sought through experiments in the field of cosmic radiation and by means of the big accelerating machines (cyclitrons) which are now being built. These experiments have already resulted in the discovery of new elementary particles which are so unstable they that have an existence of only an infinitesimal fraction of time, but which otherwise are similar in their properties to the old stable particles. According to O. R. Frisch, the Jacksonian Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, today we recognize no less than thirty fundamental particles. At least half of these displayed such unexpected and complex properties when they were first discovered that they came to be nicknamed "the strange particles". Frisch anticipates that there are yet more particles awaiting discovery: "perhaps . . . still stranger particles, with properties undreamt of so far". He is convinced that these subatomic particles are truly fundamental and that the very idea of compositeness must be left behind if we wish to understand them. "There are various indications," he says, "that the laws of geometry itself are breaking down when we come to those sub-microscopic dimensions, and I think that some radically new way of thinking will be needed before those fundamental particles can be really understood" (*The Listener*, London, Vol. LXIII, January 21st, 1960, pp. 119ff, *Exploring the Sub-Atomic World*; January 28th, 1960 pp. 173ff, *The Strange Particles*; February 4th, 1960, pp. 217ff, *Strangeness and Parity*).

"These results," as Heisenberg says, "seem at first sight to lead away from the idea of the unity of matter, since the number of fundamental units of matter seems to have again increased to values com-

parable to the number of different chemical elements. But this would not be a proper interpretation. The experiments have at the same time shown that the particles can be created from other particles or simply from the kinetic energy of such particles, and they can again disintegrate into other particles. Actually the experiments have shown the complete mutability of matter. All the elementary particles can, at sufficiently high energies, be transmuted into other particles, or they can simply be created from kinetic energy and can be annihilated into energy, for instance, into radiation. Therefore we have here actually the final proof for the unity of matter. All the elementary particles are made of the same substance, which we may call energy or universal matter; they are just different forms in which matter can appear" (*Op. cit.*, p. 139).

While, therefore, it is legitimate to describe the hydrogen atom as the universal element or substance of the sensible world, it is illegitimate to conceive of it in terms of the static, concrete materialism of the physics of yesterday—which was true as far as it went, but which, as we now know, was inadequate and superficial, and no more than preliminary to our present understanding of reality. The hydrogen atom itself is a complex, not a simple, entity. The old idea of "inert matter" must (except in the naïve sense of everyday experience) be abandoned. The very concept of matter has had to be radically revised, so much so that the new understanding of things may perhaps best be conveyed by saying that our material world has an immaterial substructure, that it is immaterial at heart.

The modern answer to the age-old inquiry, then, is that *energy* is the substance (in the exact sense of the word: *sub-stantia*) of the universe. Moreover (if we may avail ourselves of the Aristotelian mode of thought) it is apparent that this *substantia* is also in the fullest sense *potentia*. But this fascinating and exciting picture of the structure of the cosmos still presents us with questions which are as yet unresolved. Whence does this immensely potent but apparently insubstantial substance of energy come? What is its origin? Or again, how it is that its potential is so generally latent, so much so that, from the phenomenal aspect of most things, it does not seem inaccurate to speak of *inert* matter? Why is not all matter, like this table at which I am writing or this house in which I am living, visible in a *kinetic* state, like the effervescence of soda-water? That so-called inert matter has potencies, which are other than quiescent becomes apparent, for example, in the phenomenon of combustion, whereby this house and all the things in it visibly can undergo a drastic transformation. Combustion, indeed, may be said to be synonymous with the release of energy, the actualization of the *potentia*, whether it be the neuro-muscular activity which leads to the kicking of a football, the disintegration of magnesium in water, or the propulsion of an aeroplane. These things, when witnessed, are indications even to the naïve observer without any scientific knowledge that matter, in its potencies at least, is not inert.

The more man comes to learn of the nature of things, the more he comes face to face with the stupendous, "scientifically" inexplicable question-mark which stands over all his discoveries; for, just when he

thinks that he has within his reach the key to unlock the enigma of the universe, he finds that the (as he believes it to be) simple fundamental unit which he has isolated is itself an astonishing complex, a veritable microcosm, a universe of its own. Thus the atom of the chemist is not after all an indivisible ultimate (*ἄτομος*) but a microscopic solar system whose sun (or nucleus) contains the potential energy of a universe—an energy, moreover, which so far from being microscopic is in its fantastic possibilities revolutionary for the good or ill of mankind. Likewise the biologist finds that the structural cells of living tissue, whose discovery at first had seemed to promise so much, disappoint his hopes of displaying the simple secret of life, since they prove to be themselves highly complicated entities, strongly individual in character and possessing, minute though they may be, an astonishing variety of chemical, physical, electrical, and other properties, and selective mechanisms which are directed towards the preservation of their own well-being.

The biologist has developed methods of analysing the chemical, physical, and other properties of living tissue, and is able to tell us a great deal both qualitatively and quantitatively about its functions. But life is not the sum of the chemical and physical elements involved. As Herman Dooyeweerd, Professor of the Philosophy of Law in the Free University of Amsterdam, has said: "The complicated and in large measure unstable associations of proteins as displayed in the internal sphere of a living organism *nowhere occur*, as far as our experience goes, *outside of the living organism*. Their building-up and breaking-down take place in so-called *bio-chemical* and *bio-physical* processes in which it is the organic life-function which plays the leading and controlling part. These processes take place, in other words, within the typical total-structure of this organism and thus can never serve to make plain the *origin* of the organic life-function. . . . Indeed, the physical and chemical substances which go to make up a cell-body are no part of the actually living organism, but have only an *enkaptic function* in the latter, and likewise in the specific processes of assimilation and dissimilation. Even the most complex protein molecule lacks the typical hylocentric, kinocentric and morphocentric structure of a living cell. It lacks the typical totality-structure of a living cell-body which maintains its identity in all the processes of the building-up and breaking-down of its physical and chemical substances" (*Schepping en Evolutie*, in *Philosophia Reformata*, Kampen, 3e en 4e kwartaal, 1959, p. 128).

What is to be said about these *imperia in imperio*, the atomic solar system and the living cell-unit, except that the knowledge of the secret of life and matter cometh not by observation? Whether we are talking of the energy potential that informs the elements of lifeless matter or of the intangible something which we call life that uses and organizes these elements for its own purpose, we are always left with the all-embracing mystery, namely, the mystery of *origins*. Whence came this fundamental pervasive substratum of energy in the first place? Whence this phenomenon of life?

This question concerning the origin of things has, of course, occupied the thought of men in every age. The speculations of those early Greek philosophers at which we have already glanced were, apart from other considerations, unsatisfactory because they failed to grapple with the problem of the origin of the primordial element or elements which they variously proposed. The postulation of the eternity of matter on the presupposition that *nihil ex nihilo fit* was little better than a cutting of the Gordian knot. Anaxagoras, indeed, another of the presocratics, seemed to approach nearer to a solution with his doctrine that Mind or *Nous* is the principle of all things, while, like Empedocles, he held that indestructible elementary particles are the *substantia* of matter, which by processes of combination and separation explain the formation and dissolution of things. Socrates, when once he heard someone reading from a book written by Anaxagoras, was so delighted because it appeared that he held that Mind was the cause of all things that, expecting to find in Anaxagoras a congenial preceptor, he eagerly procured his writings and read them. He describes, however, how his hopes were soon dashed when he found that Anaxagoras made no satisfactory use of Mind, assigning the cause for the ordering of all things not to it, but to "airs and ethers and waters and many other absurd things" (Plato, *Phaedo*, 97Bff.).

Aristotle also criticized the early etiologists on the grounds that they were nothing more than materialists—including Anaxagoras, whom he accuses of employing mind, like the dramatic authors, as a *deus ex machina* whenever he was at a loss to explain the necessary being of anything, whereas otherwise he ascribed the cause of things to anything other than Mind (*Metaphys.*, 985a, 18ff.). In Aristotle's judgment, the principle which these philosophers had failed to investigate was the principle of the origin of motion (*op.cit.*, 984a, 15ff.). Pythagoras and his followers had already, it is true, propounded the doctrine that it is *numbers* which constitute the first principle of all things and the key to the understanding of the universe, and in doing so they certainly assigned to the objective world a basis of rationality. But their teaching, such as we know of it, was the consequence of intellectual abstraction rather than what we should call today scientific investigation, and is dismissed by Aristotle as superficially conceived (*op. cit.*, 987a, 22; also 990a, 18ff.; but see the whole of this interesting section beginning at 985b, 23).

Aristotle, moreover, rejected the transcendental theory of *ideas* which his former master Plato had elaborated. Plato's idealism was a distinctively *noumenal*, as opposed to materialistic, concept; but it should be remembered that it was in no sense intended to explain the origin of matter, which was regarded by him as an eternal principle. It was intended rather to portray a heavenly *civitas* free from the supposedly inherent evil of the material world. In Plato's physical doctrine, which is set forth in the *Timæus*, not only is there an endless dualism of the spiritual and intelligible, the realm of the ideas, on the one hand, and the sensible and corruptible, the realm of matter, on the other hand, but the *force* behind things, the cause of the *cosmos*, is the Demiurge, the divine Reason, by whose agency the material world, which is the product of the blind necessity of nature and chance,

was fashioned into a semblance of form and orderliness. Thus, for Plato, matter in all its manifestations, including that of the body, is the irreducible surd, which clogs and corrupts the spirit, and from which the soul of the wise man longs to be liberated. In this as in other respects, the thought of Plato is characteristically Pythagorean. This radical dualism not only persisted in the sphere of humanistic thought, but even invaded the Christian Church in the early centuries of our era under the various guises of docetism, gnosticism, and neoplatonism, and was also implicit in the mystical theology of later times.

In criticizing Plato's theory of ideas, Aristotle complained, among other things, that the ideas or forms postulated by Plato, being motionless, fail to explain the motion and change of sensible objects, which themselves were supposed to be images of the ideas (*Metaphys.*, 991a). This criticism, however, appears to be somewhat less than just because it fails to take into account Plato's postulation of the Demiurge as the principle of function and organization. Aristotle, in his turn, assigned four first causes of things: (i) the being and specific nature of a thing, which is the formal cause; (ii) the matter (*hylè*) and substance of which it is made, which is the material cause; (iii) the source of its motion, whereby matter is reduced to form, which is the efficient cause; and (iv) the purpose or good end on account of which the efficient cause acts, which is the final or teleological cause (*Metaphys.*, 983a; see also the first two books of the *Physics*). *Hylè* is the substratum of the sensible world, the *materia prima* of pure potentiality, from which all things are formed. The ultimate efficient cause, the *fons et origo* of all motion, whereby potentiality is translated into actuality, is attributed to the unmoved First Mover, which also brings a thing to the realization of its final end, being itself the Good in an absolute sense (*Metaphys.*, 1049b). This Prime Mover, moreover, must be pure act, without any degree of potentiality, and therefore incapable of being acted upon and changed, and therefore immaterial. It is concluded, further, that the Prime Mover's activity is entirely spiritual and intellectual. The God of Aristotle is the *νόησις νοήσεως* (*Metaphys.*, 1074b)—not, however, personal in any Christian sense, for any concept of creation and providence, and indeed of contact with the world of men, and thus of worship, is missing.

The Aristotelian philosophy has been of particular significance in the history of Christianity because of its incorporation into the Church's system of thought, particularly through the works of Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. The pagan philosopher who refused to be exorcized stayed on to be canonized, and his influence continues unabated in the Roman Catholic Church up to the present day. Thus in the new codex of Canon Law issued by Pope Benedict XV in 1917 it is decreed that "the study of philosophy and theology and the teaching of these sciences to their students must be accurately carried out by professors according to the arguments, doctrine, and principles of St. Thomas which they are inviolately to hold". This decree has committed the Roman Catholic Church to the dominance of the Aristotelian-Thomistic synthesis, in which the scriptural ground-motive is illicitly combined with the Greek form-matter ground-motive

—though in fact the two stand in radical antithesis to each other—to form a new dialectical ground-motive of nature and grace. This dialectical synthesis of nature and grace becomes a possibility only when the scriptural doctrines of the Fall and its effects and of salvation by grace alone on God's part through faith alone on man's part are abandoned or distorted. As Herman Dooyeweerd has observed, "so long as this ground-motive of philosophy was dominant it led constantly to the manifestation of typical dialectical tensions in Christian thinking, which at one time was being driven dangerously in the direction of paganism with its emphasis on the primacy of 'nature' (in its typical scholastic sense), and at another time in the no less dangerous direction of mysticism with its disregard of the creation motive of 'nature' and 'sin' and its desire to escape from 'nature' through the mystical experience, and then again in an open dualism which permits 'nature' to be evaluated in complete independence and wishes to enforce a radical divorce between 'nature' and 'grace'" (*Reformatie en Scholastiek in de Wijsbegeerte*, Vol. I : *Het Grieksche Voorspel*, Kampen, 1950, p. 36).

The influence of Aristotle on the mind of Thomas Aquinas is clearly seen, for example, in the famous "five ways" by which the latter seeks to prove the existence of God. The first way is that of the argument from motion (which is defined in Aristotelian terms as "nothing else than the reduction of something from potentiality to actuality") whereby Aquinas finds it "necessary to arrive at a first mover, put in motion by no other". Secondly, there is the argument from the nature of the efficient cause, according to which if there were no first cause, itself uncaused, among efficient causes there would be neither an ultimate cause nor any intermediate causes. Thirdly, there is the argument from possibility and necessity, which is designed to show that, to explain the contingency of all things in the world, "there must exist something the existence of which is necessary". Fourthly, there is the argument from gradation, according to which the concepts of "more" and "less" imply the existence of a "maximum", so that "there must be something which is to all beings the cause of their being, goodness, and every other perfection". And, fifthly, there is the argument from the governance of the world for a particular end, that is, the teleological cause of things, which implies the existence of an intelligent governor "by whom all natural things are directed to their end" (*Summa Theol.*, Pt. I, Q. ii, art. 3).

One comment must suffice: though the Prime Mover of Thomas Aquinas is definitely a personal God who is both Creator and Governor of the world, yet it is noticeable that he makes no reference to the specifically Christian doctrine of creation according to which the *eternal power and godhead* of the Creator are unmistakably attested, not only by the cosmic order of the sensible world which confronts man on all sides (and which is the essential presupposition for all rational and scientific activity) but also by the very constitution of man himself, both as part of that created order, and even more particularly as a creature *formed in the image of God*. This, above all else, is the inescapable and ever-present "argument" which surrounds and is within every single man (Psa. viii; xix. 1ff.; Rom. i. 18ff).

Inextricably linked with this truth is, of course, the doctrine of the Fall, the effect of which may not be explained merely negatively, as Roman Catholicism both medieval and modern has sought to explain it, as the loss of a subsequently added extra to creation (*donum superadditum*) defined as "original righteousness", with the consequence that fallen man is still man-as-created, *in puris naturalibus*, possessing pelagian or at the very least semipelagian capabilities; but rather as the positive depravation of human nature as created, with the result that man sinfully sets his face against God, wishing himself to be as God, wilfully suppresses the truth concerning the eternal power and godhead of the Creator—a truth which he *knows* perfectly well, and cannot help knowing, since it is manifest within and around himself. No man who writes or speaks as a *Christian*, subject to the scriptural revelation, should ever leave these cardinal facts out of account, for it is precisely here, at the very root of man's existence as created and fallen and in need of redemption, that the point-of-contact for Christian apologetics is located.

* * * *

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was fundamentally a return to the biblical creation-fall-redemption ground-motive. But the revolt against the authoritarian enslavement of the human mind which provided the impulse of the Renaissance-movement of the preceding century, and which in so many respects had prepared the stage for the drama of the Reformation, gave rise to yet another governing concept or ground-motive, defined by Herman Dooyeweerd as the ground-motive of "nature" and "freedom". The Reformation was indeed a great spiritual and therefore a great intellectual and social liberation of man's being, for with its threefold emphasis of *sola gratia*, *sola fide*, and *sola Scriptura* it penetrated, evangelically, to the very centre of man's being and basic need as a fallen and sinful creature severed from the meaning of his existence. The liberation it brought, however, was not the fruit of any theory of the independence of man; far from it, for above and through all it stressed the *absolute and inviolable sovereignty of Almighty God*, on whose goodness and decree man is entirely dependent not only for creation, the origin of his being, and providence, the continuance of his being, but also for redemption, the salvage of his being. It stressed the authority of God over man in and through the Bible as the Word of God addressed to the mind and will of man and revealing clearly to him both his true nature and destiny and also the sovereign acts of God in creation, redemption, and judgment.

Thus the watchword of the Reformation was *solī Deo gloria*, and man's true liberty was rightly placed in the setting of his willing obedience to the all-wise and loving will of God—"whose service", as the Anglican collect puts it, "is perfect freedom". (The collect was derived from the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, which reads: *cui servire regnare est.*)

The essentially humanistic nature-freedom ground-motive, on the other hand, proclaims the independence of man and the sovereignty of the human spirit. Man is regarded as *creative* of the world in which he

is placed—not, of course, in an originating sense, but in the sense that his mind and personality, which are heralded as the world-forces of ultimate value, impress their character upon the universe and give it its distinctive character, especially in the realms of intellectual, artistic, and scientific activity.

This attitude is in reality a sinful perversion of God's creation-mandate to man to subdue the earth and have dominion over it—a mandate which throws into relief the image of God in which man was created, and which, within the framework of an ordered universe (cosmos), explains the very possibility of all intellectual, artistic, and scientific activity. In subduing the earth, however, (for man, though fallen, is still man : the divine image is marred, but not lost) fallen man, as all history testifies and not least contemporary history, fails to subdue his own dislocated nature. In harnessing the forces and energies of the universe he shows himself incapable of harnessing the wild beast of his own selfish will. Thus the stupendous advances in human knowledge and invention of our time—such as the conquest of the air, the development of radio and television, and the manipulation of nuclear energy—instead of being means of unmixed good to the human race have been also means of destruction, falsehood, and fear. Instead of serving the noble ideals of beauty, truth and goodness, literature and art are all too frequently debased and debasing. All merely human systems of philosophy, however massive they may be, are as finite and fallible as those who manufacture them because, so far from being directed to the glory of God, they work outwards from man as though he were the centre and key of reality, and inevitably end in the darkness of vain speculation. Yet man cannot live without philosophy : knowing as he does that the universe cannot be without meaning, that it is a coherent unity, he longs to discover the meaning of things—and the meaning of his own life.

These considerations serve starkly to underline the unresolvable *contradiction* that lies at the core of fallen human nature, which, being turned away from God in whom alone the true meaning and purpose of existence are to be found, is dogged down the ages with frustration and futility. Mere humanism, which, because it repudiates the essential Creator-creature relationship, perverts man's true humanity, is only a single step from inhumanity ; and mere rationalism is constructed upon the quicksand of irrationality, for nothing is more irrational than to leave God out of the picture. How bitterly conscious man should be that, in rebelling against the sovereign word of God, he has eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good *and evil* !

The unprecedented setbacks which humanism has suffered through the global wars and hatreds of the last two generations, though giving rise to uncertainty and disillusionment, have not, however, been followed by the eclipse of humanism. This may seem surprising, because inconsistent ; but is it not really so, because, whatever the circumstances, the outlook of unregenerate man is and will always be thoroughly humanistic. The Fall itself is precisely the affirmation of humanism. Accordingly, our day of insecurity has seen a new passionate and indeed desperate assertion of the humanistic nature-freedom ground-motive under the guise of existentialism. This modern philosophy is addressed

to man who finds himself adrift in a world of hostility and meaninglessness. It assures him that there is no significance in history apart from the significance of his own history, and that there is no meaning in life apart from the meaning of his own circumscribed existence. He is invited to discover the authenticity of his existence in the isolation of his own individual experience and in the face of anguish, helplessness, and the blank inevitability of death. He must leap with hopeless arrogance into the dark abyss of chance and nothingness. He must choose for himself, self-assertively, that inexorable destiny over which he has no choice. He must declare himself master of a futile fate over which he can have no control. It is a subjectivism of despair and yet of defiance, a vestige, pathetic and inverted, of the noble spirit of man who was created to rule and have dominion over the works of God's hands in humble and joyful obedience to the will of his Creator.

* * * *

But in no sphere has the nature-freedom ground-motive become more pronounced and more widely accepted than in the evolutionism of the past hundred years. For a long time, of course, the evolutionary philosophy was one of boundless optimism. Its keynote was that of irresistible progress. Its grand perspective covered the development of life over unimaginable periods of time, from the original primordial slime (a concept of evolutionary faith, or myth, not of scientific observation) through an almost infinite series of imperceptible and undemonstrable gradations to the crowning achievement of modern scientific man. Man could now rejoice in the uninhibiting assurance that he was a risen, not a fallen, being. In general as well as in principle evolutionism was a comprehensive affirmation of the freedom of nature and the dignity of man who, not now in need of redemption or intervention "from above", was moving gloriously forward on the way to ever greater achievements.

This confident philosophy of evolutionism embraced the concept of the universe as self-sufficient, as a closed system impervious to interference from without. All that was necessary for the upward march of nature was inherent within itself. Nature was praised as an absolutely independent and self-adequate system, manifesting a consistent pattern of fixed laws in accordance with which, as man discovered them, every single fact and phenomenon of the world would ultimately be explained. "Science" was the new oracle at whose lips man could and would learn the truth.

Yet in more recent times the now classical doctrines of evolutionary progress have been subjected to revision and modernization which can hardly be described as other than revolutionary. The same dark clouds, hanging threateningly over all the achievements of man's civilization, which encouraged the growth of the philosophy of existentialism have caused evolutionary faith in the inevitable progress of humanity, and of nature as a whole, to ever new heights of conquest to seem like a fanciful legend or an unsubstantial pipe-dream. Thus so ardent an advocate of evolutionary optimism as H. G. Wells ended his days in the gloom of disillusionment, convinced that nature had become tired of man and was abandoning him and his civilization to self-destruction ;

Julian Huxley, no less fervent a worshipper at the shrine of evolutionism, has declared that progress is no longer inevitable, and indeed that evolution, that erstwhile irrepressible force, is now at a standstill, with the single exception of the human germ plasm, which is the one slender thread on which all hope of future advancement hangs; and so intractable a humanist as Bertrand Russell has felt constrained to bow before "omnipotent matter" and "omnipotent death".

Evolutionary faith, moreover, has encountered a further major stumbling-block in the impressive development of the science of genetics, which is concerned with the very field, that of heredity, in which evolution has claimed to speak with sacrosanct authority. With the precision of genuine experimental science, the study of genetics has demonstrated not only that life does not come from lifeless matter (as the ignorant once believed) but also that all life comes from previous life of the same kind. The attempt has been made to circumvent this awkward fact by the invention of the now fashionable theory of evolution by means of mutation—a mutation being an accidental change in the normal chromosome structure by which the particular characters inherited by an organism are determined. Professor Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University, for example, has recently affirmed that "evolution occurs because the conservatism of heredity is counteracted by forces of change", and that "these forces are mutation on the gene level, and sexual reproduction and natural selection on the population level". He adds that "if the assumption is made that life arose from inanimate matter only once, then the entire diversity of genes must have resulted from sequences of mutational changes in the progeny of the same primordial gene or genes" (*Species after Darwin*, in *A Century of Darwin*, London, 1958, p. 22. See also his book *Evolution, Genetics, and Man*, New York, 1955.) It will be observed that, in a manner typical of evolutionists today, Dobzhansky turns a blind eye to the established findings of the science of genetics so that he may posit the assumption that life originally arose from lifeless matter and then on that assumption construct the further assumption that life in all its variety as we know it today is to be explained as the result of a fortuitous sequence of mutations.

Biological species are defined by Dobzhansky as "mating communities", as "genetically closed systems", or as "genetically closed Mendelian populations" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 25ff.). This implies that "the seemingly endless diversity of living creatures" is none the less "everywhere combined with discontinuity". It is this factor of discontinuity—evident, for example, in the fact that dogs mate only with dogs and not with jackals—that makes classification into species possible. Between different species, in other words, mating does not take place. Species, however, are viewed by Dobzhansky as "not static but dynamic entities"—dynamic in the sense that new species may develop from them by the process of what is called "speciation". This process of speciation is defined as "the stage of evolutionary divergence at which a Mendelian population becomes split into two or several Mendelian populations the gene exchange between which is impeded or prevented by one or by a combination of several reproductive isolating mechanisms". Dobzhansky,

in fact, describes speciation as "a critical phase of the evolutionary process" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 37ff.). To the question, whether there are any observable examples of "uncompleted speciation", that is, of speciation in process of taking place, in mid course, so to speak, Dobzhansky answers in the affirmative, and the example he offers is that of the salamander *Ensatina Eschscholtzi* found in California, certain populations of which in the south appear to be reproductively isolated from each other, whereas in the north "these species are connected by an unbroken series of intermediate population", which are able to exchange genes. The latter, then, provide an instance of speciation in process (*loc. cit.*, pp. 46ff.).

Dobzhansky, further, makes the declaration that "it is no exaggeration to say that if no instances of uncompleted speciation were discovered the whole theory of evolution would be in doubt", and thus that "what is a difficulty to the cataloguing systematist is a blessing to the evolutionist" (p. 48). Species, according to him, "consolidate the evolutionary gains of the past and thus facilitate further evolutionary progress" (p. 55).

It is necessary to offer some critical observations, not concerning the natural phenomena to which Dobzhansky draws our attention but concerning the interpretation which he imposes on these phenomena. No evidence whatever is adduced to prove that speciation of the Californian salamander cited consolidates any "gains", evolutionary or otherwise. Indeed, how even the most ingenious scientist could possibly demonstrate that one species of salamander is better or more advanced than another it is impossible to imagine, all the more so when account is taken of the fact that the different species are so similar in appearance that it is difficult to distinguish one from another. But, even more important, whatever speciation as defined may effect, it is clear that the resultant genetically closed Mendelian populations do not cease to belong to the genus Salamander. In actual fact, they may be said, if anything, to belong even more narrowly to their own genus; for speciation as defined by Dobzhansky is not a splaying out, a crossing over to form new genera, let alone families, orders, classes, and phyla, but a sharpening or pointing within the limits of the genus concerned. So far from supplying some of the "missing links" to bridge the gaps between the different genera, it is a movement in the opposite direction creating ever more gaps which, *ex hypothesi* and by definition, are not bridgeable. This can only be described as extraordinary in a volume which is devoted to the praise of Darwin. Dobzhansky would be far more logical were he to conclude that his doctrine of speciation indicates that the whole theory of evolution must be in doubt and that the mysterious gains which species are supposed to consolidate are the result not of scientific investigation but of wishful thinking.

* * * *

We confess that we prefer the good sense of the comments which another scientist, Dr. W. R. Thompson, offers concerning the evolutionary hypothesis in his Introduction to the Everyman edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (London, 1956). "I am not satisfied," he says, "that Darwin proved his point or that his influence in

scientific and public thinking has been beneficial." He rightly points out that the manner in which evolutionists present their arguments makes discussion of their ideas extremely difficult. "Personal convictions, simple possibilities, are presented as if they were proofs, or at least valid arguments in favour of the theory." There is an elusive character about the arguments employed, and this, coupled with a certain plausibility, seems to eliminate the need for proof and even to render them immune to disproof. "Darwin did not show in the *Origin* that species had originated by natural selection; he merely showed, on the basis of certain facts and assumptions, how this might have happened, and as he had convinced himself he was able to convince others." But "the long-continued investigations on heredity and variation have undermined the Darwinian position. We now know that the variations determined by environmental changes—the individual differences regarded by Darwin as the material on which natural selection acts—are not hereditary."

The variations known as mutations come within a different category for they are due, not to environmental influences, but to some sudden change in chromosome structure. So far from being adaptive, they are, in general, "useless, detrimental, and lethal". The attempt of modern evolutionists to explain evolution as the result of mutations is a confession that evolution can no longer be regarded as a process of steady and progressive inevitability, but as dependent on the chance appearance of genetical "freaks", on which natural selection, that undefined and undemonstrable omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient Something, must then seize in the cause of organic advancement. This hypothesis, however, is unsatisfactory not simply because it irrationally offers an explanation of the whole ordered system of the biological world in terms of random and disordered occurrences, but also because it entirely fails to take into account the fact of organic correlation, that is, the fact that the life of an organism in all its aspects and at every stage of its development is related to its functional organization as an integrated whole. "Darwin himself," writes Thompson, "considered that the idea of evolution is unsatisfactory unless its mechanism can be explained. I agree, but since no one has explained to my satisfaction how evolution could happen I do not feel impelled to say that it has happened."

Another problem for the evolutionist (*pace* Dobzhansky !) is seen in the fact that the biological realm in all its diversity is open to classification, or taxonomy. "Taking the taxonomic system as a whole," says Thompson, "it appears as an orderly arrangement of clear-cut entities which are clear-cut because they are separated by gaps." Though Darwin sought to circumvent this problem by devising the theory that the intermediate entities which should have filled these gaps were constantly eliminated by natural selection, yet if his doctrine of evolution as constantly and tirelessly taking place were true we should reasonably have expected there to be no gaps at all, or at least to find these gaps constantly being crossed by entities in different stages of intermediacy; and certainly we should have expected clear evidence of this in the fossil remains of the comparatively remote past. But, as Dooyeweerd points out, "here also, after the

intensive investigation of the last hundred years, no fossil intermediate-forms have been found". (*Schepping en Evolutie, ut supra*, p. 138). To quote Thompson again: "What the available data indicated was a remarkable absence of the many intermediate forms required by the theory; the absence of the primitive types that should have existed in the strata regarded as the most ancient; and the sudden appearance of the principal taxonomic groups." Moreover, even the chronological succession of the fossils is open to doubt, for "it appears, generally speaking, that the age of the rocks is not determined by their intrinsic characteristics but by the fossils they contain; while the succession of the fossils is determined by the succession of the strata".

Sir Arnold Lunn has drawn attention to the fact that "both Darwin and (Thomas) Huxley realized that the observed uniformity of Nature raises serious difficulties for the evolutionist. For, if evolution be a fact, evolution must still be taking place. Life, as Huxley pointed out, should still be emerging from lifeless matter, whereas he was forced, as he admitted, to accept that this had happened by an act of faith. Again, if evolution is still occurring we should expect, as Darwin pointed out, to find all Nature 'in confusion', nascent forms everywhere, and types clearly evolving into other types, but instead we are struck, as Darwin admitted, by clear lines of demarcation between the species, and no evidence whatever of nascent types such as the first embryo feather" (Letter in *The Tablet*, London, April 23rd, 1955). See also Lunn's book, *The Revolt against Reason*, London, 1956).

Thompson expresses the judgment that the success of Darwinism was accompanied both by a decline in scientific integrity and also by a decline of belief in the supernatural and of Christianity itself. "It is clear," he writes, "that in the *Origin* evolution is presented as an essentially undirected process. For the majority of its readers, therefore, the *Origin* effectively dissipated the evidence of providential control."

While it is true that the propounder of evolutionary teaching is largely concerned with the concept of development and with the problem of origins mainly within the perspective of his theory of development (such as the origins of different species), yet it is impossible for him to disregard the problem of origins in its ultimate sense. The thorough-going evolutionist may regard evolution as a process entirely independent of any outside control and expound it as being subject to the random occurrence of mutational variations, but he still regards it as a *purposeful* process. Were it not so, his whole hypothesis would fall apart. And in order for evolution to be purposeful there must be some directive agent which enables an organism to grasp what is advantageous and to turn aside from what is harmful. Furthermore, since this agent is not permitted to be external, it must be internal. For the evolutionist today, as of last century, this agent is called by the name of *Natural Selection*. But let it be clearly understood that natural selection is not an experimental objectivity of genuine science. It is a *mysterium*, an animistic refinement of contemporary culture, a supposition which has been rushed into the role of a presupposition, so that now it is accepted uncritically as a *datum* on the basis of which

the whole hypothetical process is explained and justified. Thus Dobzhansky describes it as "the great force", the force which "allows only adaptively coherent gene combinations to perpetuate themselves" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 24, 38). But such an assertion, however categorical it may be and however convenient to the dogmatics of evolutionism, belongs literally and strictly to the realm of the imagination. To postulate natural selection, albeit with the best of intentions, is not the same thing as to bring it into being. Apparently it has not occurred to the evolutionist that he ought to tell us what natural selection *is* before he tells us what it *does*. What is this mysterious unseen force? Whence did it originate? On what genuinely scientific grounds may it be accepted as an object of faith if not of sight?

If these are questions which are still left without an answer, the case is different (though hardly less unsatisfactory) where the problem of the origin of life is concerned. It is, of course, obvious that the original appearance of life in the distant past is not something which the scientist of today can investigate in his laboratory. But, should he propose a hypothesis concerning the origin of life in our world, the least we can expect is that any such hypothesis should be recognizably scientific in the sense that it is not repugnant to the exact and undisputed scientific knowledge which we now possess. This expectation, however, is gratuitously disappointed; for it is a common doctrine of evolutionists that life, when it first appeared, originated from lifeless matter by some enigmatic process of spontaneous generation. Such a hypothesis, however, is completely incompatible with the scientific facts as we know them today. Scientifically, the once popular notion of spontaneous generation is altogether discredited. It has been demonstrated beyond a peradventure that (as we have already observed above) all life comes from previous life of the same kind. To postulate the occurrence of spontaneous generation in some remote and unobservable past can only be deprecated as the opposite of scientific and a disservice to sound reason. It is a clear case of a hypothesis being formulated to justify a hypothesis. "To establish the continuity required by theory," says Thompson, "historical arguments are invoked, even though historical evidence is lacking. Thus are engendered those fragile towers of hypotheses based on hypotheses, where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion."

Philosophically, too, this theory of the origin of life is disreputable; for it is universally acknowledged that what is prior and originates is superior to that which it originates. The engineer is superior to the machine he has devised, the bird to the nest it has made. For life to have originated from lifeless matter implies that lifeless matter is superior to life, which contradicts all knowledge and experience. Far more respectable is the ancient Greek concept of an eternal dualism of matter and spirit. But the only satisfactory and logical answer to the question of the origin of life is the Christian answer which proclaims God, Himself eternally and perfectly Life and Spirit, as the Originator of all things, both animate and inanimate, in accordance with the purpose of His will and wisdom, thereby confirming man's innate assurance that life and spirit are original and supreme.

The book of Genesis may not be a scientific text-book, but it is

scientifically unimpeachable when it declares not only that all things owe their existence to God, but also that all things living were so ordered by Him as to exist and reproduce themselves *after their kind* (Gen. i. 11, 21, 25). Genesis and genetics are in harmony with each other. That variation and adaption take place is an indisputable fact, but they take place always within the "kind", never in such a way as to cause one "kind" to pass over to another or to originate a new "kind". It remains a scientific constant that all life comes from previous life of the same kind. Propagation of the species is always *specific*. It is precisely this fact which makes it possible for Dobzhansky to define species as "genetically closed systems".

* * * *

Another problem with which the science of our day is concerning itself is that of the origin of the material universe—and this is a question which goes far back beyond the question of the origin of life on our planet. The present situation, from the scientific point of view, has been well described in the Reith Lectures for 1959 on *The Individual and the Universe* by A. C. B. Lovell, Professor of Radio Astronomy at Manchester University and Director of Jodrell Bank Experimental Station. To look into outer space is to look into the past, because of the time it takes for light from other bodies in space to reach us here on earth. Accordingly, Lovell bids us remember "that at any moment we see the sun as it existed eight minutes ago, the nearest star as it existed four years ago, and that for our nearer neighbours in extragalactic space the light and radio waves by which we study them have been travelling for millions of years and our information is that much out of date". It is precisely the possibility of studying through our modern telescopes the conditions which existed so long ago that he regards as being "of crucial importance to the inquiry into the origin of the universe and to speculation about its future history". Although Lovell computes that by means of a giant telescope such as that on Mount Palomar it is possible for an observer to penetrate to a distance of about two thousand million light years, yet he is of the opinion that "there is no indication that we are seeing anything but a small part of the total universe". There are depths beyond, which he avidly wishes to penetrate, if only because the farther out into space man gazes the farther back into the past he is moving, and the greater his hope of viewing things at an early stage of their development. It may be, as Lovell thinks, that the limits of man's visual penetration of the universe from this earth have practically been achieved. The earth's surrounding atmosphere forms a tiresome visual barrier. But it is a barrier which he expects soon to be surmounted, by the setting up of new observation posts on a man-made satellite or on the surface of the moon, where there will be freedom from atmospheric obscuration and the possibility consequently of seeing much greater distances into space and into the past.

There is, however, another obstacle of a more intractable nature which results from the modern concept of the universe as a constantly expanding system of galaxies. "Unfortunately," says Lovell, "there are fundamental difficulties introduced by the recession of the

galaxies which no device of man will ever surmount. At the present observable limit of the large telescopes the galaxies are receding with a speed of about one-fifth of the velocity of light. From this aspect alone we face a limit to future progress. Even if no other effects intervened we could never obtain information about those further regions of space where the velocities of recession of the galaxies reach the speed of light. The light from the more distant galaxies will never reach us".

As things are, two rival theories as to the origin of the universe are in fashion with scientists. The one, which Lovell favours, supposes that all has developed from a huge "primeval atom", or "gigantic neutron", which "contained the entire material of the universe" and whose density "must have been inconceivably high—at least a hundred million tons per cubic centimetre". The other theory is that of the continuous creation of matter in the form of atoms of hydrogen which constitute the basic stuff of all matter. According to this view, the universe is in a steady state, since it is supposed that as distant galaxies recede beyond the limits of our vision their place is continuously being filled by others which are coming into being. According as a telescope situated, for example, on the moon was able to determine whether ulterior space is less densely populated with galaxies than nearer space, or whether the density does not vary, it might be possible to decide which of these rival views is to be discarded. On the other hand, it might well show that both theories are erroneous. "New difficulties will certainly appear," confesses Lovell, "and these might make my present description of the universe as out of date as the static egocentric description which was in vogue in the first twenty years of this century". Indeed, he speaks of "deep apprehension, born of bitter experience, that the decisive experiment nearly always extends one's horizons into regions of new doubt and difficulties".

But, whether true or false, neither of these theories provides an answer to the ultimate question of the origin of matter. Lovell frankly admits that as the modern watcher of the skies seeks through his observations to arrive at an explanation of the origin of our universe he must pass "from physics to metaphysics, from astronomy to theology", and that it is "when we inquire what the primeval atom was like, how it disintegrated, and by what means and at what time it was created" that we "begin to cross the boundaries of physics into the realm of philosophy and theology". Similar question-marks stand alongside the theory of the continuous creation of hydrogen particles: whence do they come? how or by what agency are they brought into being? It is a theory which makes use of the distinctively *theological* concept of creation, and which might even be regarded as introducing in an intellectual sense the classical Greek device of a *deus ex machina*; yet, ironically enough, Professor Fred Hoyle of the University of Cambridge, whose name is closely associated with it (see, for example, his book *Frontiers of Astronomy*, London, 1955), is a professed atheist and will not allow God or theology to be brought on to the scene at any price!

In the face of these ultimate questions it is humility before God and not humanistic arrogance that is demanded. The following wise words spoken by Max Planck, one of the outstanding scientific thinkers of

modern times, deserve to be carefully weighed : " That we do not construct the external world to suit our own ends in the pursuit of science, but that *vice versa* the external world forces itself upon our recognition with its own elementary power, is a point which ought to be categorically asserted again and again in these positivistic times. From the fact that in studying the happenings of nature we strive to eliminate the contingent and accidental and to come finally to what is essential and necessary, it is clear that we always look for the basic thing behind the dependent thing, for what is absolute behind what is relative, for the reality behind the appearance, and for what abides behind what is transitory. In my opinion, this is characteristic not only of physical science but of all science. . . . After all I have said, and in view of the experiences through which scientific progress has passed, we must admit that in no case can we rest assured that what is absolute in science today will remain absolute for all time. Not only that, but we must admit as certain the truth that the absolute can never finally be grasped by the researcher. The absolute represents an ideal goal which is always ahead of us and which we can never reach. . . . Science cannot solve the ultimate mystery of nature. And that is because, in the last analysis, we ourselves are part of nature and therefore part of the mystery that we are trying to solve " (*Where is Science Going?* ; London, 1933, pp. 198f., 217).

The humility and good sense of scientists so eminent as Planck and Lovell befit men who are probing the secrets of the universe, and one could wish that these virtues were characteristic to the same degree of all men of science. It is important, however, that we who are Christians should insist on a further universal truth which has been much too commonly overlooked. Man is not only surrounded by the mystery of the absolute : he also possesses certain definite *knowledge* concerning the world of nature and its origin. This fact is emphasized by St. Paul in Rom. i. 18ff., where he explains that the truth that there is a supreme Creator, to whose everlasting power and godhead the visible order of the universe bears clear testimony, is known to all men ; but that it is a truth which fallen man in his ungodliness and unrighteousness suppresses. It is a truth, moreover, which is manifest *in* man, for man himself is both a part of the created order and also and especially that crowning part created in the image of God.

Every man finds himself face to face with these two related facts : firstly, that the ordered system of the natural realm is itself a revelation of the truth that all has been made in accordance with the design and purpose of a sovereign Creator—a fact which carries the further inevitable implication that man, since he belongs to this same system, is himself a creature and therefore dependent upon and answerable to his Creator ; and secondly, and even more crucial for man, is the fact that he has been created in the divine image, that he, in a particular sense, bears the stamp of his Maker. This means, quite simply, that every man, by his very constitution as well as because of the surrounding witness of the natural order, knows, inescapably, the truth behind all truth, namely, that God exists, and that He is the Creator and Originator of the universe in which man is placed. In a word, every man knows beyond all peradventure the ultimate answer to the pro-

blem of origins. To deny the existence of God, to discredit the sovereignty of the Creator, to assert the self-adequacy of man, or merely to leave God out of the reckoning, is typical of man as a fallen creature in rebellion against his Supreme Maker, and the man who does so is (as St. Paul says) without excuse because he is suppressing the known truth.

Now, this means, further, that he is not only acting untruthfully but also unscientifically, for *science* is precisely *knowledge*, and to suppress knowledge is anti-scientific. But it is more than the suppression of knowledge in a general sense: it is the suppression of that very knowledge which is fundamental to all knowledge and without which there could be no scientific activity. As Sir Edmund Whittaker has said, "in a world that was not the expression of intelligence, science could never have come into being" (*Space and Spirit*, London, 1946, p. 130). The scientist's tacit and indeed innate presupposition that the world he is investigating is a coherent whole, that facts have meaning, and that one fact leads on to another, is an expression of the great fact, however unwelcome, that he is created in the image of God whose universe he is investigating by means of the God-given and God-reflecting faculties with which he has been entrusted.

* * * *

It is precisely this suppression of the known truth which is inextricably bound up with the history of religions. Indeed, in discussing the problem of origins we must not neglect to give some consideration to the question of the origin of religion. The ultimate origin of religion lies in man's very constitution as a creature of God, stamped with the image of his Creator. As such, man can never be self-sufficient; his true existence is one of obedient dependence on God and his proper attitude is one of worship—summed up in the acknowledgment of his creatureliness by prayer, praise, and gratitude to his Creator. In short, man is essentially, by his very constitution, a *religious* being. His finitude can have meaning and purpose only as he willingly accepts his proper place and fulfils his allotted task within the scheme of things ordained by his infinite Maker.

There should be no cause for surprise that in our day the origin and development of religion have come to be viewed and explained in terms of evolutionism. The evolutionary principle, if it is correct, must be applied to every aspect of life, since, *ex hypothesi*, it is responsible not only for morphological structures and biological processes, but also for the appearance of the higher capacities of emotion and thought. It has accordingly become a fashionable doctrine today that religion had its origin in the dawning realization of primeval man that there were forces, elemental, seasonal, and mysterious, surrounding him and acting on him, but which he was unable to explain. This element of mystery was, we are told, the seed of religion. The nameless powers, sometimes hostile (as in sickness, death, and disaster), sometimes favourable (as in marriage, birth, and prosperity), were powers with which he felt it necessary to come to terms, to propitiate with some sacrifice, to ingratiate with some gift. As these forces came to be

personalized, so particular objects which had become associated with their special activities or manifestations were venerated, and representations of them were fashioned and worshipped. In this way the concept of superhuman entities or gods was given expression; and as man evolved so his religious faculty evolved also, ever becoming less gross and more refined, until today it finds its noblest expression in Christian ethical monotheism.

According to this evolutionary perspective, of course, the distinction between the different religions in the world, for example, between fetishism and Buddhism and Christianity, is purely relative and not in any sense absolute: all tend in the same direction, expressing, some more adequately, some less, man's consciousness of the numinous according to the particular stage which his development has reached. All is a matter of relativity. Thus Edward Caird, in his Gifford Lectures on *The Evolution of Religion* (2 volumes, Glasgow, 1893) welcomed "the great reconciling principle of Development". This principle, he says, "has made it possible for us to understand the errors of man in the past as partial and germinating truths; and to detect how ideas grow up under forms which are inadequate to them, and which finally they throw off when they have reached maturity. It has made it possible for us to give a more satisfactory, because a more discriminating answer to many questions which a previous generation settled with a simple 'yes' or 'no'; to stop the strife of warring dogmatisms by showing that the question is not one of absolute verity and absolute untruth, but between more or less of each. . . . The idea of development thus enables us to maintain a critical spirit without agnosticism, and a reasonable faith without dogmatism; for it teaches us to distinguish the one spiritual principle which is continually working in man's life from the changing forms through which it passes in the course of its history. It teaches us to do justice to the past without enslaving the present, and to give freedom to the thought of the present without forgetting that it, in its turn, must be criticized and transcended by the widening consciousness of the future" (Vol I pp. ix f.). In defining religion, what we have to look for, according to Caird, "is a principle which is bound up with the nature of man and which, therefore, manifests itself in all stages of his development. A definition of religion in this sense . . . will express an idea which is fully realized only in the final form of religion, while in the earlier stages it can be seen only obscurely, and in the lowest and earliest it might escape us altogether but for the light thrown back upon it by that which has arisen out of it. It will thus enable us to cast the light of the present upon the past, and to explain man's first uncertain efforts to name and to realize the divine, in the light of the clearer consciousness and more distinct utterance of a later age" (*Ibid.*, pp. 46 f.).

Now, it is important to recognize that this whole evolutionary concept of the origin and development of religion, whether it has our approval or not, is diametrically opposed to the scriptural doctrine of the history of religion—a doctrine which can be discussed only very briefly here. The picture which the Bible presents is, firstly, that of man as originally created enjoying perfect and unclouded communion

with God, and therefore religiously fully integrated and in this respect in no need of development or progress; secondly, that of man as fallen away from God because of the mutiny of sin, and therefore religiously disintegrated and estranged at the very soul of his being; and, thirdly, that of man redeemed through the atonement of Christ and thereby religiously reintegrated, the wholeness of his being restored, and the harmony of communion with his Maker recovered. This is the grand perspective of Holy Scripture. Mankind is divided into two radical categories: the fallen and the restored, the lost and the saved, man-in-Christ and man-apart-from-Christ. And the history of religion, which is inevitably *human* history, is placed within this same setting. Man, in falling, has dragged down his religion with him. The religions of heathenism and paganism, so far from being on the road which leads from original darkness to ever fuller light, are degenerate and debased. They are symptomatic, in fact, of man's fallenness.

There is no more graphic passage in the New Testament than that in the opening section of the Epistle to the Romans (to which we have already had occasion to refer and to which we must now turn again) in which St. Paul surveys this very subject of the history of religion (Rom. i. 18-32). The Apostle starts, as we have seen, by insisting that no man is in the dark concerning the fact of the eternal power and godhead of the Creator, but that, on the contrary, all men enjoy the light of the knowledge of this truth. It is a truth, however, which fallen man, who himself wishes to be as God, suppresses in unrighteousness (verse 19). His religious darkness, therefore, is self-induced, and so he is without excuse (verse 20). He cannot plead, for example, that he is only at an early and primitive stage of religion, or that his error is merely relative to an obverse side of truth. The rebelliousness of sin is seen in the fact that man, although he *knows* God to be the Maker and Giver of all, yet fails to glorify Him as God; although he *knows* that he owes all he is and has to God, yet his response is one of ingratitude. This is fundamental folly. It is a reversal of reality. But man in revolt humanistically chooses this folly as his wisdom, and in professing himself to be wise (in his own right and independently of God) he has become a fool (verses 21f.).

This, however, is only the start of the declension of religion. Fallen man, in a typical state of humanistic contradiction, wishes to be as God, as not-man; but, being by constitution a creature, and fundamentally a religious being, he must have some object of worship. And so perforce he manufactures a substitute god: he changes "the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things" (verse 23)—the very order in which these categories are mentioned suggests a history of increasing degradation. By way of illustration, it is sufficient to mention the numberless idolatries, modern no less than ancient, mental as well as material, the anthropomorphic Olympian deities of Hellenic religion possessed of the unbridled lusts and passions of sinful man, the worship of mortal emperors, and sacred cows and fish-gods and deified serpents, personality-cults, and so on and on. All this is not a matter of relative truth, but of "exchanging the

truth of God for a lie and worshipping and serving the creature rather than the Creator" (verse 25). And it involves not merely the degeneration of religion but also the degeneration of man, leading to the appalling catalogue of vices, violences, wickednesses, and unnatural sins with which the chapter ends.

Nor is all this something remote from our much vaunted twentieth century civilization, applicable only to so-called primitive and undeveloped savage peoples. The very enormities which the Apostle lists all flourish within our modern civilization, and to an alarming degree. What could be more contemporary and relevant to our social and international problems at the present time than the following recital? "For this cause God gave them up unto vile passions: for their women changed the natural use into that which is against nature: and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the women, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working indecency, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was due. And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding covenant-breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful; who, knowing the ordinance of God, that they that practise such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also approve of those who practise them" (verses 26-32). Though outwardly so different, our Western civilization is potentially as heathen, pagan, idolatrous, and abandoned as any culturally backward society of the jungle; and in those places where it is not actually so it is the salt of Christianity which preserves it from complete corruption. Nothing is more dehumanizing in its effects than the rebellious self-centredness of mere humanism.

Let us also see quite clearly that the religious relativism which is inseparable from the evolutionary perspective discountenances the biblical doctrine of the uniqueness of Christianity, and accordingly cuts at the very root of the Church's missionary enterprise. On the evolutionistic premisses it is no longer possible to proclaim that Christ alone is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and that no man can come to the Father except by Him (John xiv. 6). No longer is it permissible to announce that there is salvation in none other than Christ, since there is no other name under heaven, that is given among men, whereby we must be saved (Acts iv. 12). The dominical commission to open the eyes of the nations, "that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in Christ" (Acts xxvi. 18), must be dismissed as nugatory and misconceived. Indeed, without the religious absolutism of the Gospel the Church has lost her *raison d'être* as the community of the redeemed whose specific task is to proclaim the good news of reconciliation to God through Christ as the divinely appointed way of salvation. In fact, if anything is plain, it is that the New Testa-

ment presents man with an either/or, not, as evolutionism would have it, a both/and.

And it is, finally, axiomatic that if we are in error about the origins of things, whether of the universe, or life, or religion, or salvation, we shall be in error about all that follows. That is why the questions discussed, all too inadequately, in this contribution are of crucial importance for the Christian no less than for mankind in general.

INCOME TAX AND THE PURCHASE OF THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

The following extract from a letter to Mr. Kenneth Lewis, Member of Parliament for Rutland and Stamford (to whom we are indebted for this information), from the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Sir Edward Boyle, will be of interest to many of our clerical readers who have long desired some ruling concerning the question of tax relief in connection with expenditure on theological books :

“ If the church authorities buy a clergyman theological books which he needs to fulfil his duties or, where he buys such books himself, they bear the expense, the Inland Revenue would not normally regard their value as an emolument of his office. If, however, the church simply gives him a cash allowance for books without regard to his actual expenditure, the Inland Revenue would regard it as part of his emoluments.”

Readers are asked to note that the Editor cannot entertain correspondence on this matter.

Book Reviews

Reviewers in this Issue

The Rev. Professor G. C. B. Davies,
M.A., D.D.
The Rev. John Goss, M.A.
George Goyder, Esq.
The Rev. E. M. B. Green, M.A.
The Rev. R. E. Higginson, M.A., B.D.
The Rt. Rev. Frank Houghton, B.A.
The Rev. A. V. M'Callin, B.A., B.D.
Malcolm McQueen, Esq., M.A.
The Rev. Canon T. G. Mohan, M.A.
The Rev. J. A. Motyer, M.A., B.D.
The Rev. Canon A. W. Parsons, L.Th.

Arthur Pollard, Esq., B.A., B.Litt.
The Rev. W. C. G. Proctor, B.A., B.D.
The Rev. S. S. Smalley, M.A.
The Rev. L. E. H. Stephens-Hodge,
M.A.
The Rev. J. B. Taylor, M.A.
The Rt. Rev. J. R. S. Taylor, M.A.,
D.D.
The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D.,
Bishop of Leicester.
The Rev. Principal J. Stafford Wright,
M.A.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND JEWISH WORSHIP : A STUDY OF THE RELATION OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL TO THE ANCIENT JEWISH LECTIONARY SYSTEM.

By Aileen Guilding. (Oxford University Press.) 247 pp. 30s.

Dr. C. K. Barrett's *The Gospel according to St. John* has, with some fairness, been described as the end of an era in Johannine studies. Miss Aileen Guilding's *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship* may, perhaps prove to be the rise of a new one. It certainly breaks new ground through the trackless wastes of rabbinic studies and offers new and constructive solutions to old problems. With Dr. Herbert Danby and Dr. Austin Farrer among her tutors, it is not surprising that the new Professor of Biblical Literature at Sheffield should have written a book remarkable for its encyclopædic rabbinic knowledge and for its determination to seek Old Testament patterns in New Testament writings.

The book supports with a wealth of detailed argument the thesis that St. John's Gospel is to be interpreted in the light of Jewish synagogue worship ; it is, in effect, a Christian commentary in the triennial cycle of lections which, she argues, were not only in existence, but firmly established in the first century A.D. She believes that the themes of the discourses which form so notable a feature of this Gospel were suggested to the evangelist by the lectionary readings ; these were familiar to the Christian public through their attendance at the synagogue worship until their expulsion in the 80's after the Council of Jamnia. In short, she thinks, the evangelist is preserving an authentic historical tradition of the sermons we are told Jesus preached in the synagogues ; and he is preserving this tradition in a form suitable for liturgical use, perhaps especially among those recently deprived of their accustomed worship in the synagogue. This would go far to explain Johannine chronology, at once so insistent upon its historicity, and yet so apparently "outside time" and at variance with the synoptics ; for lectionary purposes, she suggests, the month

is important, but the year is not. This could account for the cleansing of the temple being placed by the synoptists at the end and by John at the beginning of the ministry; both date it approximately to Passover time (and John has his own reasons—most tortuous, according to Miss Guilding—for placing it in the year he does) and it is this connection with the lectionary that is important.

Miss Guilding divides the gospel into five parts: (a) the prologue and (b) the epilogue (both of which she finds closely integrated with the whole and descriptive of the growth and work of the Church), (c) the manifestation of the Messiah to the world (i. 19—iv. 54), (d) the manifestation of the Messiah to the Jews (chs. vi, v, vii-xii), and (e) the manifestation of the Messiah to the Church (chs. xiii-xx). This division of the Gospel (possible, but no more probable than the many different divisions that have suggested themselves to commentators) is then correlated with something over three lectionary years. In the first two sections of the book, historic and lectionary time coincide; in the third an entire lectionary year is traversed between chs. xiii and xx; though the historic events recorded here last little more than a week, the themes of the great annual festivals are brought out in successive chapters of the Supper Discourses.

Having thus set the stage, Professor Guilding goes through the divisions of the gospel, examining them in the light of their appropriate readings from the Law, Prophets, Psalms and comments by the rabbis. There is no doubt at all that the result is most impressive. Plausible solutions for such problems as the name Malchus, the 153 fishes, the city called Ephraim, the six vessels each containing two or three firkins are all found in the lections for the season in question. Her conclusion is that the evangelist regarded all scripture as the God-given testimony to Jesus which was the ultimate authentication of all that He did and said, and that the evangelist used it not haphazardly, as has often been supposed, but within the framework of the lectionary cycle.

There will, however, be many readers for whom the very ingenuity of Miss Guilding's suggestions invites incredulity. For instance, i. 29 is used as evidence that the evangelist is conflating lections appropriate for 10 Nisan and 10 Tishri for communities who followed two different lectionary cycles, and is deliberately ambivalent in his terminology so as to suit both. Again, the feast of vii. 8 is held to reflect the time of the incarnation in a highly allegorical interpretation of the incident. The hand of Austin Farrer is abundantly evident. Those who think him right will hail this book as a worthy successor; those who find him incredible will find Miss Guilding no less so.

There are more serious difficulties that face this thesis. On p. 199 in the reference to Baruch, the author recognizes the danger of using documents which may belong to a later period as evidence for liturgical practice before 70 A.D. Yet what is her book but a supreme example of such procedure? For all her brilliant detective work among the *tannaim*, we do not know that there was a fixed lectionary in the first century synagogue, still less the precise details of sedarim and haph-toroth. We do not even know that the early Christians had any service at all apart from the Eucharist—which makes all the contemporary search for liturgical background to New Testament documents

so elusive. If they did have a service of the Word, we do not know that it was based on Jewish lectionary cycles. And were synagogue services in Palestine conducted in Greek? If not, the great play Miss Guilding makes of the linguistic similarities between John and Septuagint loses much of its force.

This is an exceptionally fascinating and learned book, but it is not easy either to read or to assess. The reading of it is not made easier by the writer's diffusiveness (though her recapitulations are admirable), nor by the poverty of indices (there is no biblical index, and both the rabbinic and general indices are incomplete). The assessment of it is rendered the more difficult by its originality and by the combined impression of brilliance and fantasy which it makes. In a few years it will be clear whether this book marks a new and decisive point of departure in Johannine studies, or whether, as has happened to Carrington's *Primitive Christian Calendar* (a book which aims to do for Mark much the same as Miss Guilding does for John, and which, surprisingly, she omits to mention) it will be regarded as a brilliant dead end. Until then it behoves all serious students of the New Testament to study it with care.

E. M. B. GREEN.

LITURGY AND ARCHITECTURE.

By Peter Hammond. (Barrie and Rockliff.) 191 pp. 37s. 6d.

This is a book with an axe to grind. It deals with an architectural subject on which comparatively few would feel able to comment technically, but it is a subject of much importance to churchgoers, namely the construction of new churches and the adaptation of existing churches to current needs in the setting of modern liturgical practices. The author, the Rev. Peter Hammond, Secretary of the New Churches Research Group, is not afraid to speak his mind decisively and incisively, so that the reader will put down the book aware that he has been given much food for thought.

Mr. Hammond contends that in the haste in England to rebuild churches or to build new ones in, for instance, new housing areas, "we have left the responsibility for the design of our new churches in the hands of committees and individuals, many of whom have had little understanding of the nature of the Church and none at all of the nature of architecture". To redeem "the waste and folly of the last ten years" (in marked contrast to what has been happening on the Continent) and to build some truly modern churches, the author urges that clergy and congregation on the one hand should understand their true function as the people of God and thus have some idea of what they require of their new church, and that at the same time proper advice should be available which could be used in briefing architects, springing (as the Church Assembly agreed in a recent interesting debate on this subject) from consultation between theologians, liturgiologists, and architects.

All this seems logical and sensible. Where the Evangelical reader will feel ill-at-ease is in the author's liturgical approach, dominating

as it naturally does the whole argument and basis of the book. The reader will seek in vain for any similar emphasis on the ministry of the Word. "The eucharist creates the community. The surest way of bringing home to the laity that they *are* the Church—and not the passive recipients of spiritual consolation at the hands of a professional ministry—is to make plain the full implications of the eucharistic liturgy." To achieve this end a church's layout must conform with new theological insights. "The altar is not simply the principal symbol of Christ; it is also the holy table round which the *ecclesia* gathers for the eucharistic banquet. This function is inadequately expressed if the altar is set against the east wall of the church. It is a table, not a sideboard."

What, one may ask, of the liturgy and doctrine embodied in the North Side position? This finds scant reference and seemingly little understanding. Such a comment (incidentally in a contradiction in terms) on St. Aidan's Chapel, Birkenhead, reflects the book's tenor: "Until the recent modifications the altar stood against the east wall and the celebrant at the eucharist, following a tradition which still persists in Evangelical circles in this country, adopted the 'north end' position." Or again: "The old custom of celebration facing the people is steadily gaining ground, in this country as well as on the Continent; the great practical advantage of a free-standing altar lies in the fact that the celebrant can face either east or west."

But who can deny that Evangelicals are often themselves to blame for the irksome truth that lurks in this observation: "Gone are the days when Anglo-Catholic clergymen could be distinguished with complete confidence from their Evangelical brethren by the position they adopted at the holy table. . . . These are trivial matters in themselves, but they are symptomatic of the way in which the new reformation is breaking down the familiar boundaries of a divided Christendom." If ever there was need for Evangelicals to recapture the certainty of their historic, scriptural, and fundamental doctrines, the study of this book, reflecting the wind of change around us, is a sombre warning. Indeed, as the author observes, the whole ethos of the service can be changed by a building's layout even when the 1662 communion service is used. We might well recall the late Bishop Chavasse's remark: "I see services of Holy Communion multiplied, but I do not see more Christians thereby".

As it happens I was recently able to visit the two Roman Catholic churches at Dusseldorf of which there are pictures (plates 17 and 20), and thanks to Mr. Hammond's guidance I felt much more competent to understand the startling structure and design of the St. Rochus church. I doubt not but that this would be the case with other churches visited by readers with this book in their hands. Photographs and diagrams are profuse and full of interest, which, whatever one's own views, is a commendation that one would apply no less to the contents of this fascinating book. But an awareness of the ominous significance of the arguments put forward must also be in the forefront of the reader's mind.

MALCOLM McQUEEN.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

By Gordon Donaldson. (Cambridge University Press.) 242 pp. 30s.

The quater-centenary of the Scottish Reformation this year and the conversations which are taking place between representatives of the Church of Scotland and the Church of England give this book particular interest. It is based upon the Birkbeck lectures given before the University of Cambridge in 1957-58. Dr. Donaldson sets out the evidence for a need of "reformation"—the unsatisfactory state of monasticism, the poverty of the clergy, the evils of pluralities, absenteeism, and the deplorable condition of many church buildings. This need was widely recognized by sixteenth century opinion. The author tells us that Reformation came late in Scotland, and that it came largely from within, though it began through the circulation of the Bible and of literature from abroad; that it was less violent than its counterpart in England, and there was little dislocation and less bloodshed. There were many secret meetings of worshippers, and organizations sprang up with the purpose of reform. He claims that early reforms were concerned with discipline rather than with doctrine, though there was a strong realization of the need for the preaching of the Word. The Sacraments took their proper place as a concomitant of the Word preached. He acknowledges that there was no great reverence for episcopacy because the bishops had few of the characteristics of the New Testament elders and because they had rarely been able either to sustain the dignity of their office or to discharge the responsibilities of their high calling.

Hence there was little interest in a theology of the ministry and the way was open for the suggestion of an alternative. Anti-clericalism existed, but its effect was to lower the status of the clergy by elevating the position of the laity; nevertheless, its long-term result improved the quality of bishops by an insistence upon reformation of character and behaviour. Dr. Donaldson describes the development of the "superintendents" whose function was that of the New Testament episcopacy. He shows us how there grew up a new ecclesiastical structure side by side with the old. The arrival from the Continent of Andrew Melville, the apostle of presbyterianism, whose influence worked, especially on the younger men, against the episcopal system, gave presbyterianism its powerful leadership. The transition to such a system was made easier because the eldership was already established in some parishes and the evils of the pre-Reformation system had not been wholly removed. The progress of the movement received a temporary setback in 1584 through a change in the secular administration which introduced legislation against Melville's proceedings and led to his flight into England. After his return an attempt was made to contain the two systems within the church, but it proved to be unsuccessful, and presbyterianism slowly but steadily superseded episcopacy, until in 1592 the office of bishop was formally abolished.

This is a very readable and interesting book and is based upon original research. It is claimed (not by the author) that his work proves that popular ideas about the Scottish Reformation are often

erroneous. Some may hesitate to accept this claim, particularly as the author leaves the impression of having a bias towards episcopacy, but it is instructive to compare his conclusions with those of other historians of this period.

T. G. MOHAN.

DEAN INGE.

By Adam Fox. (John Murray.) 295 pp. 28s.

There is a peculiar pleasure in reading the biography of a man whom one has known well and admired from afar. It could hardly have been possible to find anyone so well qualified to write it as Canon Adam Fox. There is no single reference to his intimate acquaintance with the Dean, but this absorbing book reveals it adequately. Moreover, he is able not only to tell the story superlatively well, but as a philosopher himself he is able to present a fellow-philosopher to the world with wisdom and critical insight. The book is in three parts. The first is a fascinating account of his childhood, of his success at Eton, of his brilliant career at Cambridge, of teaching at Eton, of a tutorial fellowship at Oxford (where he became aware of his "social defects, intellectual limitations and physical weakness" and wished he was dead), of his two-year vicariate of a West-end church (which he first emptied and then filled), and of his return to Cambridge as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity. Part two describes his twenty-three years as Dean of St. Paul's where he was not happy with his Canons (he felt like "a mouse being watched by four cats") and thought the services to be a "criminal waste of time". But it gave him a position of notable eminence from which his own intellectual and literary gifts won him great distinction and made him a national figure. His literary output was quite astonishing, but perhaps the strangest thing was his immense success as a journalist which made him popular both in this country and in America. Part three is the story of his years of retirement in which his intellectual powers were unabated. He wrote to the very end and at ninety-two he preached the Gore Memorial Lecture in Westminster Abbey.

One lays down this book with regret that it has ended, with envious admiration for the qualities which made so great a man, and yet with something akin to sympathy for his obvious limitations. He was at school with C. T. Studd but it would be hard to find two men whose religious convictions and whose careers diverged to such extremes. Hensley Henson was more akin, but he seemed always to be conscious of acting a part, whereas Inge was himself the part. Henson's autobiography suggests a close friendship between himself and Inge, but Inge's diary hardly supports it and describes Henson as one who "ceased to be a *thinker*, and so became a yes-man among the bishops". Dean Inge was subject to fits of depression and self-distrust. Each new move in his career seemed at first to have been a mistake. At Hertford College, Oxford, he said: "People don't seem to want me". After moving to his one and only parish: "I have spoiled my life most dismally". On beginning his duties at St. Paul's: "I am getting more and more depressed by the intolerable boredom and waste of time of the services".

Perhaps it would be unkind to connect this self-dissatisfaction with his religious belief. He did not look to the revelation of God in the Bible for direction, but built up his philosophy of life mainly upon Plotinus, of whom he was a devoted disciple. He says: "I have lived with him for nearly thirty years, and I have not sought him in vain, in prosperity or adversity". As a great exponent of mysticism we might have expected him to use such words of Jesus Christ. If we ask what place the Incarnation has in his philosophy he replies that it "puts the keystone in the arch". Canon Adam Fox takes as his text for this model biography a comment upon Dean Inge by Lord Oxford and Asquith: "He is a strange, isolated figure, with all the culture in the world, and a curiously developed gift of expression, but with kinks and twists both intellectual and temperamental. Still, he is one of the few ecclesiastics in these days who is really interesting."

T. G. MOHAN.

CHURCH AND PARLIAMENT : THE RESHAPING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1828-1860.

By Olive J. Brose. (Stanford University Press ; Oxford University Press.) 239 pp. 27s. 6d.

The text for the theme of this book might well be the statement of Canon Charles Smyth: "It is arguable that the Church of England was saved, humanly speaking, not so much by the Tractarians as by Lord Liverpool and Sir Robert Peel: yet no historian has yet dealt adequately with their endeavour to set our house in order". To those words, written in 1943, this work goes a long way towards supplying the answer. With the opening of the sluice gates, previously held closed through fear that French revolutionary excesses might be perpetrated in England, the Church could not expect to escape wholesale criticism from that element which was already dealing faithfully with parliamentary abuses. The outstanding figures were Bishop Blomfield and Sir Robert Peel, though the work of Bishop Lloyd of Oxford and of Lord Henley should not be forgotten; and their problem was to secure such a measure of reform as to ward off the cry for disestablishment and to preserve the traditional and essential foundations and rights of the Church while working out modifications in its relationship to a reinvigorated Parliament.

Opposition within the Church to the establishment of an Ecclesiastical Commission centred around its temporary or permanent character, and its apparent animus against cathedrals. Naturally Blomfield came in for strong censure from this group, but he always displayed a firmer touch in administrative than in theological matters, and in the thirties he was able to forward his policy of moderate reform without undue difficulty, despite some formidable broadsides from "Henry of Exeter" in the House of Lords. Dr. Brose describes the broadening of the Commission's work between 1840 and 1860 towards the management of all episcopal and capitular property, amid the many fears that this new public corporation might evade parliamentary responsibility—a distinctly modern note. By 1860, "the Reform Era

was passing into the Liberal Era, and other questions more pressing than Church management were engaging the nation ”.

The author handles her subject with insight, accuracy, and skill. There was no disguising the fact that, at this period, the centre of society was shifting from the religious to the secular, and the resultant pressures, initiated by events in Ireland, largely determined the position of the Church in England throughout the Victorian era. If the setting up of the Ecclesiastical Commission marked the instrument by which administrative and constitutional reforms were actually effected, the Achilles heel of Church-State relationships remained that of education ; and it was Gladstone who stabilized this issue in 1870-71, as also that of Church rates. And this raises the question whether the author has not done herself a disservice in restricting herself, as her subtitle indicates, to “ the reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860 ”. It is easier to defend her *terminus a quo* than her *terminus ad quem*, for by 1860, though the administrative reform was largely complete, the closely-related matters of education and Church rates were by no means settled, and to have prolonged her survey by a decade would have provided a fuller and more satisfying picture. Yet, within its limits, the author has provided a valuable addition, both scholarly and readable, to the history of the Church of England in the nineteenth century.

G. C. B. DAVIES.

HISTORY AND CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC.

By T. A. Roberts. (S.P.C.K.) 178 pp. 25s.

A major claim for the consideration of the difference between Christianity and certain other religions lies in the Christian's emphasis that his is a historic faith. But such a claim involves a philosophy not only of history but of historical method. This book represents an attempt to investigate the justification of such claims made on behalf of Christian apologetic. Beginning with an examination of the work of Collingwood and Bloch, the author proceeds to a detailed study of three books concerned with critical analysis of the Gospels : F. C. Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906), C. H. Dodd's *History and the Gospel* (1938), and Austin Farrer's *Study in St. Mark* (1951), particular attention and approval being given to the last. The final section of the book deals with the principles which must be followed if valid conclusions can be drawn from such events, accepted as fact by Christians, as the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

The purpose of the author appears on balance to be to ask questions rather than to answer them. He asserts, quite rightly, that while the truth of a historical assertion does not necessarily imply the truth of a religious claim, yet the religious claim becomes impossible if there is positive evidence that historical assertions never in fact took place. But the author is on less firm ground when he attempts to assess the relative importance of the unchanging facts of historic Christianity, and the varying interpretations placed upon those facts ; indeed on certain occasions it is difficult to discover what relationship he holds between event and interpretation—whether this must vary according

to the individual historian ; whether certain basic rules do exist for the interpretation of evidence which the good historian will accept and the bad ignore ; or whether we must agree that there is in certain cases more than one valid interpretation of an event.

The book provides a salutary warning against the loose and illogical assumptions which are occasionally put forward by well-meaning theologians ; for example, that because the Gospel accounts of the life of Jesus can reasonably be accepted as historically authentic, therefore God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. There is a relationship between these statements, but the second can only be accepted by an appeal to faith, not merely to history. But the problem posed by Dr. Roberts is essentially the relationship between faith and fact, and here the historian, precisely because he is conditioned by living in this time-space world, cannot be expected to give the final answer.

G. C. B. DAVIES.

THE COUNTRY PARISH TODAY AND TOMORROW.

By Frank West. (S.P.C.K.) 98 pp. 5s. 6d.

There are a number of "angry young men" in the Church of England today, demanding root and branch reforms to meet modern needs. It is possible that this group includes some angry archdeacons, but the Archdeacon of Newark is not one of them. Mr. West is well aware of the problems that beset us, and gives a remarkably clear picture of them, but his suggested remedies are eminently reasonable and practical, and in tune with the new spirit of concern and responsibility which is abroad in 1960. While writing primarily—and obviously from first-hand experience—about the rural areas, the author inevitably reviews the whole range of those matters which at present loom so large upon the ecclesiastical horizon—manpower, stipends, pensions, pastoral reorganization, and the rest. His deep interest in his subject, and wide reading around it, make his book far more than a doctrinaire treatment of a familiar theme. The pen is that of a man who believes in the Church of England and has not forgotten the lessons of her history, nor despaired of her future as a strong influence for good in these bewildering days.

Mr. West has an unerring touch when he picks out the lack of bishops with personal experience of the rural ministry as one of the gravest defects in the present system. How right he is to remind us that of the forty-three diocesan bishops today, only two have ever served in country livings. Patronage Secretary at No. 10, please note ! The gifts of the Holy Spirit are not limited to the university don or the organizing genius in an urban district. There are plenty of men in country parishes today who could make a real success of a rural diocese, and start off with the great asset of firsthand experience of the difficulties confronting their clergy. The author is also rightly critical of the too frequent pastoral neglect suffered by country clergy, which he terms "one of the darkest stains on the administration of the Church". His criticisms are not confined to the cloth. He repeatedly challenges the laity to take their full part in the work of the Church.

The present difficulties, he believes, are having the beneficial effect of encouraging this desirable result, and he detects a new and encouraging spirit of determination in the parishes held in plurality. He feels that suitable laymen who could read a service could supplement the work of the preaching Readers, and he suggests a new Book of Homilies, which might be used where a sermon was lacking. One wonders if any diocese has yet thought of arranging a course of instruction for such laity, or of the equally necessary acclimatization of the urban clergy before they enter a rural cure.

Our author thinks that party patronage has had its day, and yet he admits that in the nineteenth century, but for the Trusts, "scarcely an acknowledged evangelical or tractarian would have found a foothold within the parochial system". His contention that "the majority of bishops welcome men of all ecclesiastical shades into their dioceses" is not borne out by experience, and there are bishops today who are trying to extract promises from Evangelicals that they will not adopt the North Side position in the churches to which they are appointed. Mr. West's assessment of the parson's freehold is wise, and should be noted by those lately charged by the Church Assembly with the consideration of this and cognate matters. Whether in town or country, we shall be in a parlous state indeed if the clergy ever become mere diocesan employees. "To undermine the status of all the beneficed clergy of the Church of England . . . would be a move of questionable wisdom. Little would be gained if, as a result of legislation restricting the freedom of the clergy, the bishop and parishioners were given such powers that the diocese became little more than 'the bishop's show'".

This book should be studied by all who care for the Church of England, not least the diocesan bishops, and those who appoint them.

JOHN GOSS.

HOW CHURCHES GROW : THE NEW FRONTIERS OF MISSION.

By Donald McGavran. (World Dominion Press.) 186 pp.
12s. 6d.

It is many years since Roland Allen reminded us that St. Paul not only preached the Gospel but planted churches. He suggested that missionaries generally, while accepting New Testament theology, were not following New Testament methods. *Missionary Methods—St. Paul's or ours?* and the companion volume *Spontaneous Expansion* should still be required reading for candidates for overseas work. Dr. McGavran's book drives home some of the same lessons, provocatively and powerfully. Professor Kraemer commends it as follows: "This is an excellent and much needed book. It will be of great use in the overhauling which missionary strategy must receive". This "overhauling" is necessary partly because "the break up of colonialism leaves missions and younger churches searching in scores of ways for a whole new mode of mission" (p. 182). But Dr. McGavran's chief concern is to recall Mission administrators to the "continuing goal" of making disciples of all nations. "The administrator himself should sincerely desire church-growth. He should have a passion

that men become disciples of Christ" (p. 180), and will therefore seek to "avoid diversion of efforts to secondary ends", however good. He argues that if mission resources had been devoted to church growth many thousands more might have been added to the Church. The fault (so he maintains) has been partly in using men and money in various types of institutional work or inter-church aid rather than in "discipling", and partly in persisting in working "unripe fields" where there is little response to the Gospel, rather than concentrating effort on "ripe fields".

While accepting the validity of much of his criticism, one may venture to suggest that the author tends to lay insufficient emphasis on the sovereignty of God. It is surely unsafe to predict that "great church growth" will inevitably follow the adoption of certain methods. Moreover, the period of ploughing and sowing before a harvest is reaped differs enormously in different fields. True, we must sometimes adopt Paul's attitude, and virtually tell unresponsive people that we have brought them the Gospel, "but seeing ye put it from you, lo, we turn" to others (Acts xiii. 46). But there are places where God has suddenly visited a people who had for long years rejected the Gospel, and "great church growth" has followed. On the other hand, if we recognize the Holy Spirit as the true Director of all missionary enterprise, we shall be alert to mark where He is beginning to work, and be ready to divert our resources from other areas to the places where there is "a sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees".

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop

NATIONS AND EMPIRES : RECURRING PATTERNS IN THE POLITICAL ORDER.

By Reinhold Niebuhr. (Faber and Faber.) 306 pp. 25s.

The unrealism and impracticality of the U.S.A.'s post-war foreign policy is here laid bare by America's foremost theologian, who took leave of absence from Union Theological Seminary for the task. The history of mankind and of Europe is run through in order to show that the imperium always demands two inter-related qualities; force and prestige. (We meet again, in a different language, Dr. Schweitzer's memorable epitome of human history in the two words "ethique" and "affirmation", which together connote civilization.) The Roman Empire and the Byzantine, Papal, and Islamic empires which arose from its ashes in the middle ages, all supported force with the claim to universal rule on religious grounds. So does modern Russia. Their prestige was the result of military success backed by an ideology which sanctioned the use of force and even made it appear justified. Power politics throughout history has clothed itself in religious garments and thereby achieved the fanatical self-righteousness which the lust for world empire demands of its followers. The tragedy, according to Niebuhr, is that since 1945 American policy has been so blind to the realities. The decline of religion, the decay of western culture, and

the post-war American attack on British, French, and Dutch colonialism, have between them deprived the west of its prestige and thereby neutralized the value of its strategic position and forces. Thus American policy has played straight into the hands of imperialistic Russia, enabling her to display force backed by the prestige of a new religion of atheistic utopianism which bids fair to sweep Asia and Africa into the net and so to dominate the world.

After 1918 Wilsonian utopianism landed Europe into the mess called the League of Nations. Today the U.S.A. is allowing the United Nations to play the same fateful role, by confusing dreams with realities. That in politics order is the first requirement of systems, and comes before justice, is a reality and a Christian one. (Thomas Hobbes understood this fact and this accounts for his unpopularity with unrealistic dreamers and utopian religionists.) That force requires prestige to back it is also a fact of human history. This is why it is so important to realize that the United Nations, useful as a debating society, is not a source of policy so long as it lacks the power and prestige to make its policies effective. "There is in short", says Niebuhr, "no way of applying the liberal democratic standards to the expression of our power in world affairs". The duty of Christians is to be realistic. Unilateral disarmament is not practical, even with annihilation as the stake. Suez revealed the dire peril of American utopianism and brought the U.S.A. to a drastic re-appraisal of which this book is one result. Here is strong support for Eden, Macmillan, and Gaitskell from America's foremost theologian. Which liberal pacifist will dare hurl the *odium theologicum* back at Niebuhr? Or is it to the end of this world order that Christians should rather turn their minds?

GEORGE GOYDER.

NEWLY DISCOVERED Gnostic WRITINGS : A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF THE NAG HAMMADI FIND.

By W. C. van Unnik. (S.C.M.) 96 pp. 7s. 6d.

The excitement and the public interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been far in excess of their importance in throwing new light on the story and meaning of the New Testament. On the other hand the great discovery of Gnostic documents in Coptic, at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt, has aroused little public interest, except that one of the documents, The Gospel of Thomas, received a good deal of attention, including a full reprint in the *Sunday Times*.

The main facts are as follows : In 1945 or thereabouts one or more urns were dug up in Egypt containing papyrus codices—thirteen in all. Complicated negotiations followed concerning their purchase and preservation, and at last all are finding their way to the Coptic Museum in Cairo. One by one they are being reproduced and edited. Meanwhile a number of monographs about them have appeared—the work of Doresse, Puech, Quispel, van Unnik, and F. L. Cross. The book here reviewed is a translation of Professor van Unnik's "popular" treatment. It provides an excellent summary of all that the "ordinary"

student needs to know at present and shows clearly the kind of importance to be attached to the "find".

The collection contains thirteen separate books or codices, each containing one, two, or several separate works. Some works, e.g. the *Apocrypha of John*, occur several times. Other important items are the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Gospel of Truth*, and a treatise thought to come from Heracleon, a commentator on St. John's Gospel referred to by Origen. There are forty-eight writings, forty-three of which are new to scholars. Let it be said at once that the whole of this hotchpotch collection is Gnostic in character, and quite useless from the point of view of spiritual guidance today, and mostly so as a possible source of historical knowledge of our Lord's life and work. (It is not quite impossible that an authentic saying or two may be preserved here or there which otherwise we should not have known, but I consider this rather unlikely—research will guide us on this later on. But what we have here, for the first time—and this is of great importance to Church historians—is a solid corpus of original Gnostic works dating from the second and third centuries. This is something quite new. Up to now we have had to rely on scraps of material quoted by Orthodox Christian apologists like Irenæus, and on the one document known as Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora*. Now we have forty-three documents hitherto unknown. What a discovery!

Students will realize how many questions about the rise of Gnosticism are at present unanswerable. When did it start? Where did it start? Was it a Christian heresy, or a pre-Christian cult? Was it the result of Greek infiltration into Christianity, or was it an amalgam of late Jewish deviations with the Christian tradition? Was it the "science falsely so called" of I Timothy vi. 20, or the "philosophy and vain deceit" of Colossians ii. 8? All these questions have to be answered at present by intelligent guess-work, and Dr. R. McL. Wilson in his big recent work on *The Gnostic Problem*, gives cautious answers to them. But now there is a mine of information for scholars to dig in. In ten or twenty years' time, we may boldly say, Gnosticism will have yielded up some of its mysteries.

Meanwhile we can say that the gap between Gnostic and orthodox writings appears to be larger, not smaller, than it was. To this extent "the find" is encouraging to those who cling to the distinctiveness of the Christian Scriptures, and those primitive writings emerging from the same unbroken tradition. Scholars like Bultmann may find it less easy to see large slices of "Gnosticism" in St. Paul and St. John than they have been wont to do. But we shall probably find that the theological gap was larger than the ecclesiastical gap, and that, in Egypt especially, it was not always easy to know who in the second century was Gnostic or "Catholic".

I have written more about "the find" and Gnosticism than about Professor van Unnik's book (which is No. 30 in the *Studies in Biblical Theology* series), but most of what I have written comes from his book which is well worth buying and studying.

RONALD LEICESTER

THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH : A VALENTINIAN MEDITATION ON THE GOSPEL.

Translation and Commentary by Kendrick Grobel. (A. and C. Black.) 206 pp. 16s.

The discovery in the Nag Hammadi area of Upper Egypt in 1945 of a library of Coptic manuscripts belonging to a Gnostic sect, has provided New Testament scholars with important first-hand information about the intellectual climate which surrounded the early Christian Church during its period of expansion. The library consists of eleven volumes, only one of which (the so-called Jung Codex) has reached the outside world. In 1956, under the title *Evangelium Veritatis*, the text of *The Gospel of Truth*, a meditation on salvation which is one of the five parts of this Codex, was edited and published by Professors Malanine, Puech, and Quispel. Now the distinguished New Testament scholar Dr. Kendrick Grobel, of Heidelberg, has undertaken a further translation of this work, and added his own illuminating and scholarly commentary.

Dr. Grobel, following Professor Van Unnik (in *The Jung Codex*, 1955, edited by Professor F. L. Cross), believes that the author of *The Gospel of Truth* (which takes its title from the *incipit* of the work) was Valentinus himself, and that he wrote it about 150 A.D. Dr. Grobel analyses the doctrinal position of the meditation, and comes to the conclusion that *The Gospel of Truth*, like Valentinus himself (the statements of Iræneus are regarded as inaccurate), is unmistakably Gnostic, but not extravagantly so. In spite of some mythical elements, the theology is not openly a-Christian, and is indeed more nearly Trinitarian than most Gnostic compositions.

This edition of *The Gospel of Truth* provides us with a translation which is as readable as the Coptic and the state of the manuscript between them make possible, and a fully annotated commentary which every serious student of the text will find invaluable. In spite of what has been said about the theology of Valentinus, however, any casual reading of the *Gospel* will reveal a document strikingly far from anything we are familiar with from the New Testament, and a "gospel" which, *pace* Dr. Grobel, can only dimly be recognized as "the underlying good news behind the four canonical gospels" (p. 20). We must be even more grateful, then, to Dr. Grobel, for making readily available to us a work which represents so exactly one of the most subtle threats to the apostolic faith of the early Church.

S. S. SMALLEY.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

By H. Maurice Relton. (Macmillan.) 270 pp. 21s.

This volume consists of two parts, the first of which contains old material on the Christian conception of God, and a fresh study of the doctrine of the Incarnation from a psychological standpoint. Students in particular will appreciate the studies on *Nestorianism* and *The Person of Christ in recent discussion*. The latter is a challenge from the "Catholic" side of the reconstruction proposed by "Modernists"

to that problem. The conclusion is that "we are back at the point reached by the Church in the Chalcedonian definition", and if there is to be any advance, "we today have to begin our thinking afresh". The starting point must be a return to the Christian conception of God, which Dr. Relton attempts in the opening chapter of the book.

Some readers may feel that the first four chapters are the province of theologians, actual or potential, and will feel more at home in the two concluding chapters which seem to be more related to present issues in the Church. They are entitled *A study in Sacramentalism* and *The dynamic sacramentalism of St. Gregory of Nyssa*. The thesis proposed by Dr. Relton is familiar to most of us, namely: "The Incarnation is the master key to the understanding of the nature and function both of the Church and Sacraments in the world and in human life". Such a position, it is argued, is a practical step towards the reunion of the churches. There is nothing new, and much that is seriously deficient, in this view of the Church as an extension of the Incarnation. On many points the present reviewer is in full sympathy with such contentions as that "many of our theological controversies and unhappy divisions may be traced to our failure to give due weight and relative emphasis to this threefold significance of our Lord's work as Prophet, Priest, and King" (p. 207). But such a viewpoint implies *a redemptive key* to His Person and Work, and the relationship of the Church toward Him. Perhaps "Incarnation" includes Redemption and the difficulty lies in terminology.

In the last chapter Dr. Relton makes an earnest plea for the abandonment "once and for all" of the word transubstantiation. Instead he proposes a term drawn from the Catechetical Oration of Gregory of Nyssa, namely, *transelementation*. Underlying this conception is that of the Risen Lord passing through matter as when He appeared in the midst of the disciples on the first Easter evening and passed through closed doors. After a long and intricate discussion of the philosophical history of the word and idea in the doctrine of transubstantiation, Dr. Relton preserves the reality of the Presence in the Eucharist in a different way. "In some definite sense it is associated with the material elements, and yet quite clearly not permanently caught or located in the material vehicles of which He makes use in passing through them to reach us" (p. 249). This conception is crystallized in the phrase "the sacramental principle and its philosophical presuppositions, in the light of the New Physics".

Is it simply a matter of terminology? Other terms like "transvaluation" and "convaluation" have been proposed by thinkers like Dr. William Temple and Dr. W. Spens. If Luther's "consubstantiation" has right devotional value, but makes nonsense, the same might be said of this newer concept. Can the New Physics really come to our aid, so that "the form turns out to be a mode of existence which is a fiction of our minds" (p. 260)? We may account reality to be utterly mysterious, but need we seek for the mechanics in some intricate intellectual quest which savours of "the wisdom which is of this world" rather than biblical concepts which are concrete rather than abstract? In his conclusion Dr. Relton affirms that "we must close our own ranks in the Church of England before attempting to play any

decisive part in the larger movement towards reunion" (p. 268). But there is nothing in this book that will end "the Anglican Armistice" and secure our position as "a bridge-church" in Christendom. Unfortunately Evangelicals are not talking the same language as Anglo-Catholics, and they are living in a different thought-world. A return to the Bible, and to Hebraic modes of thought, is a necessary preliminary to any effort toward reconciliation.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

THE POWERS THAT BE : EARTHLY RULERS AND DEMONIC POWERS
IN ROMANS xiii. 1-7.

By Clinton D. Morrison. (S.C.M.) 144 pp. 9s. 6d.

No. 29 in the *Studies in Biblical Theology* series of monographs continues the high standard of research into the best works of scholars both in this country and abroad, but like so many in the series does not reach any definite, or perhaps better, convincing conclusion to the problem considered. In view of the situation in which the early Church found itself, how can Paul regard the State as "an ordinance of God"? Other passages in the New Testament seem to support the view that the State is "the beast rising out of the sea" (Rev. xiii. 1). The traditional answer has been to state the benefits Paul received from the Roman government as a protective power, and its roads and inns as a vehicle for the rapid spread of the Gospel, and the use of one language as opening all doors to the earliest preachers of the Gospel. But Dr. Morrison regards this kind of answer as unsatisfactory, and as contradicting what Paul writes in other places. The new solution is not psychological but theological. It is to identify the State with "the spirit world", following the line proposed by Gunther Dehn, who in turn had been influenced by Martin Dibelius. Accordingly Dr. Morrison outlines the recent efforts to interpret the passage in question, dealing especially with "the spirit world" of Judaism and the place of angelic powers in early Christian thought. Then he tries to answer the critics of this new thesis who attack it on exegetical, historical, and dogmatic grounds.

The argument revolves around the precise meaning of *exousiai* (Romans xiii. 1). The essay is an honest endeavour to break the stalemate in contemporary discussion. The only positive contributions appear to be that in the world view of Paul's day there was a strong and significant relationship between civil rulers and spiritual powers. This idea was not confined to Jewish Apocalyptic but was axiomatic to Greco-Roman thought, and fostered by the "State-religion". To live in such an atmosphere inevitably coloured Christian thinking on these matters and pointed toward the ultimate conflict between the Empire and the infant Christian community. To live "in Christ" meant to offer humble obedience where possible to the State, or else to suffer patiently for conscience's sake. Dr. Morrison contends that his essay demands a fuller consideration of the problem as it affects our understanding of the doctrine of the atonement. We are compelled to distinguish between the realm of Christ's lordship and the locus of His victory.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

CALL TO WORSHIP.

By Neville Clark. (S.C.M.) 67 pp. 7s. 6d.

As mumps is much more disastrous to an adult than to a child, so the liturgical mania displays much more acute symptoms when it falls upon a nonconformist! Those who doubt this observation, or who reject it as mere "reviewer's sauce", are invited to read Neville Clark's *Call to Worship* (which is No. 15 in the *Studies in Ministry and Worship* series). He writes as a Baptist to Baptists. His starting-point is a frank avowal that the Baptist denomination is liturgically nowhere, and that nothing less than a revolution (on this point) is required in their theological colleges. Without asserting that he hopes to spark off the revolution, he admits his purpose to be the suggestion of "principles of liturgical creation". Whereas, on p. 38, he writes soberly of liturgy arising out of theology and then, in turn, moulding the faith of the Church, the author's deeper belief seems to be that liturgical renewal is the main entrance to revival in the Church—a connection which, he says, "may be closer than we imagine" (p. 11). This is not the only point at which he stands hand in hand with those whose liturgical predilections (unhappily) take effect nearer home. The course of the book is easy to summarize, for it is clearly written. Having initiated us into the idea that liturgical reform (or introduction) is a vital thing, Mr. Clark next elucidates the "Biblical Pattern"—the initiative of God, redeeming His people and addressing Himself to them; their response to His word; Communion between God and His people; and the "remaking" of the people of God. The historical developments of liturgy are then set before us: briefly, that Western catholicism lost its grip on the place of the Word of God in the Liturgy, and turned the congregation into mere spectators, and that the Reformers (Cranmer only merits two-and-a-half lines, p. 37) while restoring the Word, only succeeded in turning the congregation into hearers instead of spectators. The Free Church Tradition, of course, rendered the congregation even more passive, and so the problem is inherited by modern liturgists.

It is clear that this is the problem which Mr. Clark sees himself as in measure, solving. How? In order to guarantee the initiative of God, and therefore the one half of the biblical pattern, we must have "the indissolubility of Word and Sacrament" (p. 39). As for the full participation of the congregation, "hope must lie in the restoration of the People's Offertory" (p. 44), and in the encouragement of congregational participation in prayers by the saying of "Amen" and the gradual introduction of versicles and responses. It is interesting to note that in the author's account of liturgical innovation in his own congregation "the one remaining innovation, which . . . would surely have constituted a storm centre, was intentionally delayed . . . the People's Offertory" (p. 63).

It will now be clear that the author's understanding of the Holy Communion is not that of orthodox evangelicalism: "At the Eucharist, in, with, and under the elements of bread and wine, the Church offers herself that she may be caught up into the eternal self-oblation of the Son to the Father, actualized on Calvary. At the hand

of her crucified and risen Lord, she receives again those elements, offered, blessed, broken, and outpoured; she enters into divine fellowship; she is remade. There is no sacrament without offering and consecration, no communion without sacrifice. Altar and table are one." The question which suggests itself to the reviewer is not whether this means anything scripturally true, but whether it means anything at all! In so far as it has a biblical origin, it may be traced to a belief that "the Bible itself conspicuously fails to provide us with a rationale of sacrifice", but that the essentials of such a rationale may be expressed in the notion of the liberation of life through sacrificial death, which life then becomes the means of blessing (pp. 40f.).

It is clear that the author's enthusiasm has led him to uncritical acceptance of many questionable things. He has failed to convey that enthusiasm to at least one reader, or even to begin to make a case for it as a profitable enthusiasm for the Church at the present day.

J. A. MOTYER.

INTERPRETING THE PARABLES.

By A. M. Hunter. (S.C.M.) 126 pp. 8s. 6d.

Professor Hunter has the knack of compressing large areas of theological thought and research into a series of brief, pithy essays. He has done it again in this his most recent volume, and done it very well. After an opening chapter of definitions and differentia as between parables, similes, allegories, and the like, he tells the story of interpretation from the excessive allegorism of Origen through the liberalistic moralism of Julicher to the crisis-theology of Dodd and Jeremias. He then proceeds to expound this most recent approach to the parables, which links them closely with the eschatological message and ministry of Jesus, and divides them into four groups, viz: parables dealing respectively with the coming, the grace, the men, and the crisis of the Kingdom, now present in the Person of its King, the Servant-Messiah. This revaluation of Our Lord's parables proves to be a fascinating study. The story of the Rich Fool, for example, is not against greed so much as a warning about the urgency of the crisis-time in which Christ's hearers were living.

Most parables, as they have come down to us in the gospels, have two settings, one in the ministry of Jesus and the other in the life of the early Church, for the process of interpretation has already begun in the New Testament. Explanations of parables like the Sower are therefore held to be secondary on the ground that the speaker who needs to interpret his own parables "is not master of his method" (A. T. Cadoux). In view of the slowness of the disciples to grasp the significance of Our Lord's teaching, some of us may feel differently about that.

In a final chapter on preaching the parables, Dr. Hunter says that there is still room for some allegorizing provided that it would be intelligible to Christ's own contemporaries. Nor is it wrong to regard these priceless tales as ethical types. But our primary concern should be always with the meaning that our Lord Himself wished His hearers

to get out of it. What was its original thrust? When we have discovered that, we are free to make our application.

Our author has written so many books on interpretation that he tends to repeat himself occasionally. There is also a mis-spelling on p. 38 (*marshal* for *mashal*). But this additional volume will enable many people to carry out Professor Hunter's main concern, which is "to drive you back to a study of the parables".

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE : INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY.

By *W. R. F. Browning*. (S.C.M.) 176 pp. 12s. 6d.

This new addition to the Torch series of commentaries is, in the author's own words, an example of a revived interest in typological exegesis after the manner of Fenton, Farrer, and Danielou. The Warden of Whalley Abbey here lists three approaches to the study of the gospels : (1) the conservative, which stands or falls on the issue of historical accuracy ; (2) the liberal, which regards the narratives as giving a fairly reliable picture of the words and deeds of Jesus, but without any hidden meaning ; and (3) the form-critical, according to which the gospels are better evidence for the life of the early Church than they are for the earthly life of Jesus. Canon Browning adopts a fourth view, the typological, and holds that each gospel is a literary unity with its own theological purpose.

As a result of this approach, Luke appears not so much as an historian of proven reliability as a brilliant theologian, who reinterprets the life and death of our Lord in terms of the first six books of the Old Testament. In this he is indebted to the work already done along this line by the author of the First Gospel (Q has been well and truly dispensed with !); his own particular task being the interpretation of Christian eschatological teaching for the generation which lived *after* the Fall of Jerusalem and to give positive content to the now acknowledged period of delay before the Parousia.

The actual commentary is clearly written and gives help at those points where help is most needed. There are valuable paragraphs on such subjects as the Virgin Birth, the miracles, the date of the Last Supper, the Resurrection and Ascension, and the exposition is always scrupulously fair.

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

WITH MY OWN EYES : A LIFE OF JESUS.

By *Bo Giertz*. Translated from the Swedish by *Maurice Michael*. (Allen and Unwin.) 237 pp. 18s.

The Bishop of Gothenburg's book is published in English in the year when once again the people of Oberammergau are presenting the drama of the Passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ. There is an obvious analogy between the two. To carry conviction, each of them must be faithful to the Gospel narrative, and particularly to the words of

Christ. To be historically correct, they must both seek to present places and people, as closely as possible, as they appeared in the first century A.D. And, to make the dramatic presentation live, they must give individuality to every character on the stage. This obviously requires the use of imagination, coupled with a sense of fitness.

How does our author meet these conditions? First, he reverently confines himself to the Scripture record of our Lord's sayings, often quoted *verbatim*, but sometimes summarized. But his narrative is almost entirely confined to the first three Gospels. He mentions none of the miracles recorded only by St. John, and includes none of the profound teaching and claims of Christ contained in that Gospel. The absence of the foot-washing from the story of the Last Supper is a serious loss.

Secondly, the book is rich in its descriptions of the topographical and historical setting of the Gospel narrative. The Bishop is clearly familiar with the Holy Land, and has mastered the history of our Lord's time. Herein the book has great value for the ordinary reader.

Lastly, the author succeeds in making his story live. He frequently shifts his television camera to different characters. Now Peter takes up the tale, now Nathanael, Matthew, or Mary Magdalene. Calvary is seen through the eyes of Simon of Cyrene, and of the penitent malefactor. Occasionally a fictitious character speaks. But throughout it is the Master that dominates the scene.

J. R. S. TAYLOR, Bishop.

THE POCKET COMMENTARY OF THE BIBLE : THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

By Basil F. C. Atkinson. (Henry E. Walter.) 428 pp. 13s. 6d.

Dr. Atkinson is Under Librarian of Cambridge University. This Commentary is dedicated to members of the C.I.C.C.U., past and present. The Commentary is being published in periodical parts and the publisher is most willing to send details. We recall reviewing the first portion of Genesis which has now been completed. The Commentary on Exodus now ready has been welcomed by many of the leading Evangelical scholars. Although its author does not refer to the Evangelical words Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, they are all there in the comment on Exod. iii. 8 : "To bring them out of the land". "Christ Jesus brings us up from guilt by bestowing upon us a perfect righteousness and standing in God when we ask for it in faith. He brings us up out of sin by giving His Holy Spirit to indwell us and daily to raise us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. One day He will bring us up from death in a glorious resurrection to be with Him and live with Him for ever in the beauties and wonders of the eternal world."

There indeed we have St. Paul's "hath delivered, doth deliver, and will yet deliver". It speaks to poor sinners of salvation from sin's penalty, sin's power, and finally from sin's presence. This volume is full of suggestions for sermons. Take as one example the commentary on Exod. iii. 14, "I am that I am". It is carefully explained and the

headings suggest that (1) the Name implies the uniqueness of God; (2) the self-sufficiency of God; and (3) the sovereignty of God.

There is an explanatory summary at the head of each chapter. Archæological references are noticed and personal and place names are explained. Difficulties like "Pharaoh's heart was hardened" are dealt with. All the comments have a way of leading to the Christ and are full of Christian experience, salvation, and service. Sometimes we ourselves feel that Dr. Atkinson's forthright comments will not always be welcomed by all readers, as, for example, his comment on the sixth commandment (p. 224): "Obviously no one who loves his neighbour will murder him, *or take his life in warfare*" (the italics are ours). But even those words make one think! This is a remarkable enterprise for both the author and his publisher. We sincerely trust that it will be warmly supported by Evangelicals.

A. W. PARSONS.

BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS.

By D. S. Russell. (S.C.M.) 176 pp. 12s. 6d.

An elementary text-book on the significance of the last few centuries before the Christian era has long been needed, and it is with pleasure that we welcome Principal Russell's book to fill this gap. Within a brief compass, though at rather a price for so slender a volume, we are given a treatment of two separate subjects. Part One deals with the cultural and literary background and incorporates a historical survey of the conflict between orthodox Judaism and Hellenistic influences. Other chapters discuss the transition from Temple to Torah religion, the nature of the Jewish sects, the development of oral rabbinical traditions, the canon of Hebrew scripture, and the non-canonical literature, not forgetting the many pseudepigraphical finds among the Qumran fragments.

Part Two deals with apocalyptic literature, first in general and then theologically under the headings of the Messiah and the Son of Man, and the Resurrection and the Life Beyond. While the earlier part of the book is helpful in providing basic information so often omitted by the student of Old Testament and New Testament subjects, these last two chapters are of great value in giving background material for understanding the theology of the gospels.

Much discussion has gone on in the last twelve years about the originality of Jesus' teaching, especially *vis-à-vis* the doctrinal beliefs of the Qumran Covenanters. It has served to remind us that our Lord's teaching was not uttered in a theological vacuum, and now Mr. Russell has helped the layman further to understand some of the religious thought which was the heritage of those to whom He preached. With all these studies, however, some caution is needed. By the nature of the case the only evidence for theological opinion is literary. Yet Jesus spoke to people, many of them illiterate, and He spoke in their language. There must always be weaknesses, therefore, in interpretations of Messiahship and so on which are derived from a handful of literary quotations and, although the Dead Sea writings have vastly increased our sources for such study, there is no evidence

that Qumran theology was typical of popular opinion, rather the opposite.

J. B. TAYLOR.

THE SACRED LANGUAGES.

By Paul Auvray, Pierre Poulain, and Albert Blaise. (Burns Oates.) 174 pp. 8s. 6d.

This is Volume 115 in a series of 150 entitled "Faith and Fact Books", a series which seeks to cover the whole area of modern knowledge in the light of Roman Catholic teaching. Of these, numbers 114-120 deal with "Catholicism and the Arts", the present volume being ably translated from the French by S. J. Tester. Paul Auvray is an Oratorian who was at one time at the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem. He writes as an ardent Semitist who delights to unfold the simplicities as well as the mysteries of ancient Hebrew and Aramaic. The treatment of the Greek language is the responsibility of Pierre Poulain, a professor at the Institut Catholique in Paris, who describes the evolution of Koinê Greek, shows the character of the Greek of the Septuagint and of the New Testament, and goes on to treat of Greek as the language of the Early Church and of the Creeds. Of ecclesiastical Latin we could not have a more succinct account than is given here by the lexicographer Albert Blaise. One observation is particularly interesting to us. Speaking of modifications of the liturgy he asks, "will there be, in centuries to come, an English, and a French liturgy, as there is a Slavonic or Greek liturgy now?" Our answer is that there *has been* an English liturgy for the past 400 years! Why then, to quote his own words, do Romanists continue to "set up a screen between congregation and celebrant which only a small minority can pierce"? Is it really to "safeguard the sacred character of our worship", or is it a fear that the laity may learn too much?

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

THE CHURCH OF ROME: A DISSUASIVE.

By R. H. Fuller and R. C. P. Hanson. (S.C.M.) 160 pp. 6s.

Interest in the Roman Catholic-Protestant controversy is marked at the present time. This book will be a help to many in directing their thoughts on this vital issue. Let us briefly describe the contents of the book. The opening chapter describes the attractive power of the Church of Rome: its voice of authority, its elaborate system of awe-inspiring worship. To an Irish Protestant this chapter seemed too idealistic in its description of the Roman Catholic Church and too severe on the contrasted Protestant alternative; though this balance is well corrected in subsequent chapters. The second chapter brings out well the suppressive influence of Roman Catholic authoritarianism on its members. "This incessant grasping after power, this silent suppression of criticism, this muffling of discussion within the fold . . . what can this indicate but a secret distrust of its own omniscience by the Roman Catholic Church?" (p. 39). The question, Are Roman

Catholic doctrines true? is dealt with in a scholarly and effective way in the following chapter. The place ascribed to Scripture in the early Church is well described, and illustrated by reference to Origen's attitude. The fascinating subject of *development* is discussed in chapter four, and the thesis of Newman is examined critically. An excellent chapter evaluating the Reformation follows, under the jocular title "Henry VIII and all that"; and, finally, we have a trenchant criticism of the doctrine of infallibility.

What class of readers were in mind in writing this book? The style of writing is occasionally "popular", but to appreciate fully the references and the reasoning one would need to have a fair knowledge of Church history and theology. Again, the attitude of the writers towards the Bible leaves a somewhat confused impression. Historically, the Reformation was able to take place because of the "discovery" of the Bible and its supreme authority. And the authority of Scripture is still the only real authority to set as an alternative to that of the Pope. The writers do acknowledge the supremacy of Scripture in the Church but, in one place at any rate when referring to the results of biblical criticism (p. 40), they speak about the Bible in a way which, in the opinion of the present writer, would rob it of our confidence.

This book will certainly help parish clergymen to deal with members of their flock who are wavering. But the present reviewer doubts if the book itself should be handed direct to such inquirers. A shorter, simpler, statement would be better, setting forth what *we* believe and what *they* believe; for the cause of wavering is undoubtedly lack of knowledge of the faith.

W. C. G. PROCTOR.

THE BORDERLAND : AN EXPLORATION OF THEOLOGY IN ENGLISH LITERATURE.

By Roger Lloyd. (Allen and Unwin.) 111 pp. 16s.

This book is an expansion of lectures given by Canon Roger Lloyd at Bangor, and is a partial fulfilment of an ambition long cherished by the author to write a book about Christian Theology and English Literature. "The Borderland" is that area of literature—in this case mostly English literature—where the writer reveals himself as a citizen of that "City which hath the foundations". It is not quite coterminous with "religious literature", though it overlaps with it. Canon Lloyd's particular interest is in that literature which either openly or covertly is dealing with the major problems of Christian Theology, the serious effort to grapple with the relationship of man to God and God to man.

One of the first and most interesting realms he explores is *Robinson Crusoe*. He reminds us of the vivid experience of conviction of sin felt by Crusoe on the desert island, and how it was relieved by coming across the words—loosely quoted from Acts v. 31, "He is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give remission". Canon Lloyd shows that Defoe on his travels in England was an *habitué* of dissenting chapels, and presumes that he was able to portray the "classic evangelical

appeal" through his contacts with them. Alongside *Robinson Crusoe*, he puts *Apologue on the Parable of the Wedding Garment* by Charles Williams. Then comes *Tom Brown's Schooldays*; then a jump to Dorothy Sayers' *Just Vengeance*. Shakespeare comes in, rather unexpectedly, with *Measure for Measure*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *Troilus and Cressida*.

So the book goes rambling on, and its author would be the first to admit that it has no very clearly marked plan or scheme. But it is suggestive. What we really have here is a "carpet bag" full of the interesting things that have stuck in the mind of a widely-read man, reading with his eyes open for thoughts useful to a Christian in his pilgrimage and a preacher in his pulpit. Reading it has led me to add a few jottings to my reading list for the holidays, and perhaps that is the kind of result its author would have desired.

RONALD LEICESTER.

THE WORLD'S LIVING RELIGIONS.

By Robert Ernest Hume. (T. and T. Clark.) 335 pp. 21s.

This is the revised (and first British) edition of a book which has gone through fourteen printings, and was originally produced in 1924. The secret of its success in this field is obvious—it is easy to handle and its treatment of the eleven living religions of the world is simple. Some people may find it over-simple, but it does base these systematic outlines of belief firmly upon the original scriptures of the faith concerned. Everything is clearly and sharply defined. Dr. Hume was evidently influenced by Ritschl's value judgments and is not a conservative theologian, but he is sensitive to other cultures, and we are thus given leave to approach him critically as Charles S. Braden, his editor, does in the present edition.

The first chapter is a sketch of Religion and Religions in which Dr. Hume shows that religion is as wide as the race, and as old. He deals with its function as giving a person confidence in life's struggles through a personal connection with a supreme power, or powers, in the world. He then analyses religion and religious experience and outlines the essential characteristics of deity, as superhuman, supersensuous, and controlling the natural world. This conception arouses within the devotee a feeling of adoration. Next he considers some alternatives to the conception of deity already given, as in philosophic Hinduism and Taoism, and proceeds to the varying emphases in these eleven faiths. "Christianity is the only religion which teaches . . . that there is at work in the world a divine universal Holy Spirit, indwelling, teaching, etc., every individual who will open his heart to this divine influence" (p. 287). Dr. Hume ends his survey with Justin Martyr's contention that "whatsoever things have been rightly said by all men, are the property of us Christians". He affirms that a study of the living religions of the world will eventually prove beneficial to a Christian's own life and thought. Here is a convenient manual for that purpose, which may serve as an introduction to larger works.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

I AND THOU.

By Martin Buber. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (T. and T. Clark.) 137 pp. 9s. 6d.

The second edition of this famous book, which was issued in German thirty-five years ago, and translated into English twenty-three years ago by Professor R. Gregor Smith of Glasgow University, contains, in addition to the original work, a fresh translator's preface, as well as a postscript by the author. In the preface, the translator tells of the impact and influence of Buber's thought upon theologians since it first appeared. These include such well-known names as Karl Heim, Karl Barth, John Baillie, H. H. Farmer, and Reinhold Niebuhr. All of these have adopted some of the categories of thought used and popularized (if that is the right word) by Buber.

He expounds his theology in the language of a prose poem. This makes his thought somewhat difficult to follow. He finds everything is twofold, going back to a primary unity. There are two primary words, each a combination; the I-THOU, and the I-IT, words. These words symbolize relations. The I-THOU relation is that of subject to subject; the I-IT relation is that of subject to object. The former relation leads into the world of religion, where God is "encountered" rather than known. The latter relation leads to the world of objects that can be known, that is, the world of science. Religion is the living relation of the self to the OTHER—the Absolute Thou. This relation can best be described as the relation of love. Love is the responsibility of an I for a Thou. All the while the author is seeking to show that religion—the encounter with God—the Supreme Thou—is a life to be lived rather than a knowledge to be acquired. All things in nature, in social contacts; in the world of spirit, lead to God, who is to be adored.

The author, of course, is not a Christian, but a Jewish religious philosopher, and the way he offers, suggestive though it is, is accordingly not that of the Christian revelation.

A. V. M'CALLIN

NO GREATER HERITAGE: THE TRIUMPHANT PROGRESS OF THE ABIDING WORD.

By Charles Gulston. (Paternoster Press.) 256 pp. 15s.

The author of this moving history of the Bible regards it as "the supreme heritage of the English speaking world". Written by a South African it tells the story of the Birth and Drama of the Open Bible, with its beginnings in an Anglo-Saxon Monastery and a sequel in the South African Veld nearly 1,300 years later. The book is in six parts: (1) the early years and the earliest versions; (2) links in the chain—Caedmon, Bede, Alfred, and others; (3) voices of protest—The Waldenses, Albigenses, and others; (4) the Defiant Reformer Wycliffe; (5) the Valiant Martyr, Tyndale, and other "Stand-Fasts"; and (6) the Abiding Word—the A.V. and other versions, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and (especially) the Book of the Trek.

The author's reverent and believing standpoint is sufficiently indicated in his closing words : " The Bible is the heritage of every nation which has rendered it into its own tongue. It is more. It is the heritage of every man who strives to obey its precepts, and who in simple trust and with a thankful spirit, accepts what it freely offers. ' Thy testimonies,' declares the Psalmist, ' have I taken as an heritage for ever '. There is none greater." We have great pleasure in commending it. The book is beautifully printed, but there is a mistake on page 17 where Constantine is said to have succeeded Diocletian in 206, which most readers will mentally amend to 306. There is an excellent bibliography.

A. W. PARSONS.

THE HUMAN SPIRIT.

Edited by Whit Burnett. (Allen and Unwin.) 409 pp. 25s.

Mr. Whit Burnett is an apparently indefatigable American anthologist, and in the volume under review he has gathered together some forty contributions divided into sections on Being, Sharing, Daring, Doing, Living, Feeling, and Wondering. The subject is wide enough, indeed as the " blurb " states, it is " common to us all, to all nations and classes and creeds ". There seems little reason why these passages, and not others, should have been chosen. The well-known and the profound are here—D. H. Lawrence, Paul Tillich, Albert Schweitzer, and here, too, are the little-known and the trivial (let *them* be nameless). Each passage is introduced by a short biographical note on the author, but no explanation is given for the divisions of the book which therefore appear as arbitrary as its omissions and inclusions. And why may not some passages have been included under headings other than those to which they have been allocated? This book will be useful, like all but the worst anthologies, for dipping and browsing, but to this reviewer it does not seem to have had any necessary claim to be brought into existence. More respect might have been shown to the human spirit by not asking it to put up with this sort of thing.

ARTHUR POLLARD.

THE AMAZING RESULTS OF POSITIVE THINKING.

By Norman Vincent Peale. (World's Work.) 286 pp. 15s.

Dr. Vincent Peale prescribes the " mixture as before ". His medicine is not the whole Gospel, but it is an important part of it. Positive thinking is a sound New Testament prescription, and is soundly based psychologically also. This new book is a kind of follow-up of *The Power of Positive Thinking*, and covers many sides of life, with plenty of illustrations from people whom Dr. Peale has known. There is a useful chapter on marriage, with questionnaires to show how mature and how satisfying one's marriage is. In one chapter the author moves into the realm of extra-sensory forces, and I should not be surprised if he gives us more about this in his next book.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

HARVEST OF THE YEARS.

Selected and Edited by Reginald Woods. (Salvation Army.)
151 pp. Paper, 5s. Cloth, 7s.

The author of this anthology is a Lieutenant-Commissioner who in 1957 became Literary Secretary and Editor-in-Chief at the International Headquarters of the Salvation Army. The extracts in the book are taken from various editions of *The Salvation Army Year Book*. Commissioner Woods has chosen some of the well-written articles of permanent value which each Year Book has contained, but because they appear in January each year are likely to be forgotten, and so "the Harvest of the Years" is lost or superseded.

Recently we had a visit during self-denial week from a young officer of the Salvation Army. He was an extremely intelligent, well-educated young man, an earnest believer, and a really keen member of the Army. Yet he knew less than we knew of the history of this remarkable movement. We have stayed with great profit to ourselves in a Salvation Army hostel, have spoken frequently in Salvation Army citadels, and have entertained at least one General and several other leaders. But there is a great deal of ignorance today, both outside and inside the Salvation Army, about its history, objects, organization, and victories. Inside the Army this is often due to the fact that at least in the smaller citadels and missions there is no library. It would be quite excellent if someone could be persuaded to make it possible to start a library in every branch of the Salvation Army and to do it by presenting a copy of the book before us.

A. W. PARSONS.

THE CREATIVE IMAGINATION.

By Kenneth C. Barnes. (Allen and Unwin.) 114 pp. 4s. 6d.

This year's Swarthmore Lecture by the headmaster of a small private grammar school is a rather cranky affair. Mr. Barnes is one of those scientists with an interest in religion who cannot help feeling that there is an almost necessary antagonism between science and religion as it now is. He is, of course, also a Quaker, and this, together with the feeling mentioned in the previous sentence, leads him to criticize, usually in a fashion that is simultaneously nagging and superior, anything which he can stigmatize as orthodox. This book is one of those challenges, so-called, to a fresh response to religion, which believes that before such a response can appear, it will be necessary to jettison the accumulated achievement of ages. It is a "Jesus for our time" sort of book. "As I see it there is a sharp and disturbing contrast between the freedom that science enjoys and the bondage in which religious expression remains." This is the kind of apologetic which admits that the battle is lost before it is begun. One misses here the graciousness which marks so much Quaker writing. No doubt it is all well meant, but this is the type of book which I find annoying.

ARTHUR POLLARD.